

He said "NRECA will use its full resources and will call upon those of all its allies in a fight to secure congressional approval of adequate funds for fiscal 1967."

He said the proposed 1967 budget level of \$270 million available for REA electric loans includes only \$220 million of new funds. The other \$50 million would be obtained by withholding funds already approved for this fiscal year.

"These restrictions," he said, "flout the expressed will of Congress, would cripple the rural electrification program and would add to a loan backlog which is already at a record high."

Mr. Anderson said surveys show a need for \$675 million in new capital for rural electric systems by the end of fiscal 1967.

"Rural electric systems are obligated to meet the full power needs of their areas," he said, "and adequate growth capital is as essential to them as to any other utility."

Mr. Anderson said the rural electric systems are urgently recommending to the President steps to "rectify this calamitous budget proposal." He said they include:

1. Asking for the issuance of a Presidential directive to the Budget Bureau and the REA to use the entire \$402 million authorized for fiscal 1966 to the full extent of need.

2. An immediate REA deficiency loan fund authorization of \$262 million to reduce the loan application backlog to manageable size.

3. An increase by Congress in the 1967 REA loan fund authorization or the establishment of an adequate contingency fund to be used as necessary for loans and not for window dressing.

"We also are urging the President to join with us in obtaining speedy passage of legislation to establish a supplemental financing program."

He explained the NRECA and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., a New York investment firm, recently completed a thorough study of future capital requirements of the rural electric systems. He said the study showed the need for funds from the private money market to supplement the Government loan program and a plan to establish a Federal bank for rural electric systems will be presented to the annual membership meeting in February.

"We have anticipated the need for supplemental capital and have taken steps to meet it but congressional action is necessary to put the new plan into effect. In the interim, the proposals made in this budget would cut the heart out of the rural electrification program."

"Over the past weeks," he stated, "we have repeatedly and clearly informed administration officials of the urgency of the loan fund problem and the consequences of such drastic proposals."

JANUARY 21, 1966.

Johnson administration budget which goes to Congress Monday cuts heart out of REA.

Other Government loan programs are hit as hard or harder, but adequate financing is essential to a utility and productive capacity of rural areas depends on electricity.

Not only is REA new 1967 loan fund request totally inadequate (\$220 million when need is for \$675 million) but this year's loan program is also being emasculated. Briefly, administration plans to approve use of only \$270 million out of \$402 million Congress approved for current year. More than one-fourth of fiscal 1966 funds is being impounded: The \$37 million we got released last June is now withheld; the \$60 million contingency which Congress approved last fall is wiped out; and \$35 million of 1966 regular authorization will not be loaned this year.

These restrictions flout the expressed will of Congress, would cripple the rural electrification program and would add to a loan backlog which is already at record high.

Over the past weeks we have repeatedly and clearly informed administration officials of the urgency of the loan fund problem and the consequences of such drastic proposals among those who have been the President's strongest supporters in rural America.

We are urging the President to take the following steps to rectify this calamitous budget proposal: (1) Issue a Presidential directive to Budget Bureau and REA to use the entire \$402 million authorized for fiscal 1966 to full extent of need. (2) Press immediately for an REA deficiency loan fund authorization of \$262 million to reduce the loan application backlog to manageable size. (3) Ask Congress either to increase requested 1967 REA loan fund authorization or establish adequate contingency fund to be used as necessary for loans and not window-dressing. (4) Join with us in obtaining speedy passage of legislation to establish our supplemental financing program.

Please contact your Members of Congress immediately and urge them to contact the President, Freeman, and Clapp in support of these four points.

NRECA will use its full resources and will call upon those of all its allies in a fight to secure congressional approval of adequate funds for fiscal 1967.

We are sending copies of this telegram to President Johnson, Secretary Freeman, Assistant Secretary Baker, and Administrator Clapp.

JERRY ANDERSON,
Acting General Manager.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UKRAINIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Saturday, the 22d of January, marked the 48th anniversary of Independence Day of the Ukrainian Republic. Unfortunately, the small republic was unable to sustain its independence and became engulfed in the land mass of the Soviet Union. The hope of one day regaining independence still burns in the hearts and minds of Ukrainian citizens both in their native land and in other nations around the world, including the United States. The spirit of independence was encouraged somewhat in my own State of North Dakota Sunday, January 23, when Ukrainian Independence Day ceremonies were held in Bismarck, Mandan, Minot, and Dickinson by Americans of Ukrainian descent.

One of the Ukrainian leaders in North Dakota is Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota branch, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., who has done much in North Dakota to keep alive the spirit of independence and liberty.

North Dakota Gov. William L. Guy proclaimed January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day in North Dakota and I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF NORTH DAKOTA

Whereas on January 22, 1966, Ukrainians in North Dakota and throughout the free world will solemnly observe the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of a free Ukrainian state; and

Whereas after a defensive war lasting 4 years, the free Ukrainian state was destroyed in 1920 and a puppet regime of the Ukrainian

Soviet Socialist Republic was installed, later becoming a member state of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the once free Ukraine is now no more than a colony of Communist Russia and its vast human and economic resources are being exploited for the purpose of spreading communism; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States of America have recognized the legitimate right of the Ukrainian people to freedom and national independence by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution in July 1959, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved and dominated by Communist Russia; and

Whereas some 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent now living in North Dakota have made significant contributions to both State and Nation;

Now, therefore, I, William L. Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby proclaim Saturday, January 22, 1966, as Ukrainian Independence Day in North Dakota and urge all citizens to demonstrate their sympathy with an understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian nation to again achieve its rightful inheritance of freedom and independence.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the great State of North Dakota to be affixed this 14th day of January 1966.

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

BEN MEIER,
Secretary of State.

Attest:

QUEST FOR GENUINE AND PERMA- NENT PEACE—ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, on last Veterans Day, November 11, the Vice President of the United States delivered an outstanding address at commemorative ceremonies held at Arlington Memorial Cemetery.

The Vice President chose the occasion to restate in clear and forceful language the broad policy that our country has consistently followed in the years since World War II in the quest for a genuine and permanent peace. This policy, as outlined by the Vice President, is based upon the maintenance of a military establishment powerful enough to meet the threat of any aggression and upon a demonstrated willingness on our part to resolve international conflict and tensions by any honorable and peaceful means.

He also took the appropriate occasion of Veterans Day, when we pay tribute to those heroes living and dead who have defended their country in time of war, to declare once again the reasons why we are involved in the bitter and frustrating war in Vietnam. In the words of the Vice President:

We are not in Vietnam to establish any American colony or base. We are not there to enrich ourselves or to subjugate others to our will. We are in Vietnam to keep a commitment established by international treaty. We are there because, once again in history, it must be proved to aggressors that the price of their aggression comes far too high.

Mr. President, no man can foretell with certainty what future course the tragic events now unfolding in southeast Asia will take or what they will mean

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

129

back a sound-accompanied television picture of everything happening in the room. Whether or not equipment of this sort is eventually perfected, the time for President and Congress to give the whole matter top priority attention is now.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Nov. 8, 1965]

THE UNSOLVED PROBLEM OF WIRETRAPPING

Wiretrapping, which has been described by various Supreme Court justices as "dirty business" and "insidious encroachment," remains an unsolved problem. It is used with increasing boldness by thousands of agencies and individuals. But evidence gained through its use cannot be presented in Federal courts or in more than a handful of State courts which have legalized the practice.

Its present status is confusing to conscientious law officers, advantageous to criminals and shakedown specialists, and deeply disturbing to the average citizen who has no way of knowing whether or to what extent his own privacy is being invaded.

Bills authorizing its controlled use subject to judicial control have been introduced in Congress repeatedly over the past decade. They have never managed to get beyond committee stage. The good bills do not permit law enforcement officials to go as far as they now go without any legislation, because even with the prohibition on wiretraps as evidence, the information so gained can be used or presented in other ways.

There would seem to be room for an investigation by an independent commission—the American Bar Association could help here—into the uses and abuses of electronic eavesdropping. How great an aid is it to the actual detection and conviction of criminals? How many people who are not criminals are subjected to this invasion of privacy for the convenience of officials? How many criminals use it as a routine part of their operations?

An answer to these and similar questions might put the problem of legislating to control wiretrapping in better perspective.

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express-News, Nov. 21, 1965]

PRIVACY RIGHTS NEED PROTECTION

The Congress should give high priority consideration to thorough review of the use of electronic devices to intrude upon individual privacy.

Insidious abuses of telephone service, electronic eavesdropping and similarly reprehensible practices need to be dealt with effectively and quickly.

For example, a telephone is installed at customer expense for his own convenience, not as a potential nuisance. To tolerate intrusions upon this service by recorded messages that can block the line or to allow the lines for abusive treatment of public figures is unthinkable.

A device available—but not in use apparently—can intrude upon private telephone service. This device initiates calls and may call back and, presumably, could effectively harass a customer and disrupt his phone service.

It should be outlawed.

Devices that have to be called by the customer are something else, again. There are useful services performed in this manner and because disagreeable political attacks are recorded for the curious listener is insufficient reason to stop them. The important thing is to prevent unwanted interference with telephone service and to stop snooping by electronic means.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World, Dec. 22, 1965]

EFFECTIVE WATCHDOG

For months Senator EDWARD V. LONG of Missouri has conducted investigations of gov-

ernmental invasions of privacy through wiretapping.

Senator LONG's committee, or at least its presence on the Washington scene, has had beneficial effects. The Post Office Department has submitted to new and strict regulations on the use of mail covers—a process under which certain citizens had their mail checked. The committee is responsible for congressional action forbidding the Internal Revenue Service to open first class mail.

The hearings of the Long committee revealed that the mail of thousands of Americans had been or was being watched. It was also shown that the Food and Drug Administration was attracted to the policy of bugging and snooping devices and had minimum regard for the rights of individual citizens about whom it was suspicious.

In large part, the subcommittee's work clearly exposed the fact that too many medium and high level Government officials had been overzealous in conducting the investigative work of their offices. The Long investigation brought much of it, but perhaps not all, to a virtual halt.

Every American citizen ought to rejoice at the effective work performed by the Senator's hard-hitting investigative group. But this should not be the end of it; the work of the committee must not be forthwith abandoned so that, ultimately, officious governmental agencies will fall back into the same bad habits.

To many people, congressional investigative groups are either useless, politically motivated or of nuisance value. This has not been the case with Senator LONG's committee, and every American who cherishes his individual rights of citizenship in a free country should appreciate the work that has been done.

For our part, the Long committee is perfectly welcome to continue in existence if for no other reason than to stand as a warning against those in Government who would exceed their authority.

COMMUNITY DISTRICTS—A SOUND PROPOSAL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the community development message submitted by President Johnson on Tuesday outlines an approach to rural planning and development that is badly needed and long overdue.

It makes sense to tie orderly and comprehensive planning of public services and development to the existing pattern of trading areas. Common interests within these areas are recognized and understood by the people.

A major effort now is underway to deal with the rural poverty and disadvantage so common across the country. Federal agencies are cooperating with the States in making available a wide range of new programs to stimulate economic growth and upgrade essential services. Yet, despite this commitment, progress often is slowed by the lack of sound local planning.

Small communities, of course, cannot afford the services of a professional planner. And it does not make sense to have Federal agencies financing one of these experts for each and every small community.

What is needed is area planning on a scale large enough to be efficient but small enough to be kept under control of the local people. The community development districts proposed in this message appear to meet both these tests.

Regional planning for a functional community built around a trading center should greatly increase effectiveness of available resources for economic growth and community development.

It can insure that the programs adopted add up to a mutually reinforcing and logical effort to solve a community's problems at minimum cost. And it can stretch thin resources in a way that would be impossible through fragmented, sporadic, and inconsistent efforts.

It is sound policy to give the States considerable responsibility in this planning, as this proposal does, and to require that they draw the lines of these districts. It also is sound policy to assure that the planning direction and later decisionmaking are left to representatives of the smaller units of government involved.

This proposed development district approach provides a new way for counties—too often faced with declining populations, outward migration that results in a high proportion of older citizens, and an eroding tax base—to work together to arrest or reverse these trends.

REA'S PROTEST DRASTIC REDUCTION IN 1966 AND 1967 LOAN FUNDS PROPOSED IN THE BUDGET

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, the rural electrification cooperatives of America are alarmed by the proposal in the administration budget to reduce their loan funds far below the minimum necessary for them to maintain service.

Some time ago I proposed that we bring their 1966 loan funds up to the level of their needs by a supplemental appropriation.

The budget reveals that about \$50 million of those funds is being impounded, or withheld, when the total is already inadequate.

For the information of Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to place in the RECORD a press release on the proposed budget action issued by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the text of a telegram sent by the association's acting general manager to the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John Baker, and REA Administrator Norman Clapp.

There being no objection, the press release and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 24.—The Nation's rural electric systems today told President Johnson his 1967 budget would "cut the heart out" of the rural electrification program.

In a telegram to the President, Jerry L. Anderson, acting general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, said the slash in funds comes at a time when the rural electric systems are faced with increasing need for growth capital to meet the power demands of rural people.

"The new budget calls not only for too little funds for fiscal 1967," Mr. Anderson said, "but we are shocked to learn that the administration plans to lend only a portion of the funds which Congress has already authorized for 1966."

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1207

to the future of our country and the peace of the world. But I believe there is a forceful message in the Vice President's remarks to any who may doubt the determination and resolve of the American people. I recommend this Veterans Day speech to the Members of this body and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted at this point in my remarks:

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, VETERANS DAY, ARLINGTON MEMORIAL CEMETERY, NOVEMBER 11, 1965

We meet today to honor brave men and deeds. We enjoy the freedom their valor won. On this resting ground of American heroes, we meet to examine the lessons of war. We meet to commemorate a day of peace.

When a nation sends its young men to war, it must be sure indeed that the cause is worth the terrible cost. In this century young Americans have given their lives in two world wars—and in conflict since—for a noble purpose: The cause of a just and lasting peace.

Have we learned the lessons of this century so that peace may finally be secured? When World War I ended 47 years ago today, it seemed that anything but peace was unthinkable. But the peace of World War I was lost when the free and strong nations of the West closed their eyes to international bullying in other places. It was lost when large nations justified the sacrifice of small nations to those playing the game of willful power.

Today we know that World War II began not in 1939 or 1941 but in the 1920's and 1930's when those who should have known better persuaded themselves that they were not their brothers' keepers.

It is now 20 years since the end of World II. These have not been years of peace. They have been years, rather, during which there has been an absence of world war.

There continues to be aggression and despotism in the world. And, often without benefit of fullest homage, American men continue to sacrifice their lives in distant places.

The danger of war—nuclear war—torments mankind. But that war has not occurred because, in these years, we have consciously and devotedly worked to win the peace.

We have dared to stand firm against those who would terrorize their neighbors.

We have extended the hand of cooperation to both the strong and weak, the rich and poor of the world. We have come to realize that anything that happens on this planet can and does affect us all. We have learned that there is no place to hide in a world which grows smaller day by day.

In Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, in Korea, in Vietnam, we have stood with other nations against aggression when those places could have been sacrificed as was the Sudetenland—and with the same probable end result.

Through the Marshall plan, point 4, the United Nations, the NATO alliance, the Organization of American States, and other international agencies and programs, we have made known our commitment to the interdependence of nations and international cooperation.

Through the maintenance of powerful military forces we have demonstrated our ability to meet aggression. Through patient and sometimes painful negotiation we have shown our determination to halt the arms race and control the atom.

But, above all, we have fulfilled the responsibility of leadership. We have not

waivered. We have not turned inward. We have not withdrawn from the world. And we will not.

We know that mankind can destroy itself in one horrible nuclear holocaust. We know that one more totalitarian military adventure, one more exercise in international irresponsibility, can obliterate what man has created through the ages.

But, there are those who would have us turn away from the lessons of this century. They plead, as others have pled before, that mankind's plight in other places need not be our concern. We hear—even in Western nations scarred by centuries of war—the appeals of those who would turn modern nations away from interdependence and international cooperation. These voices must be rejected. There is the counsel of despair and defeat.

Today in Vietnam we reaffirm our knowledge of the lessons of war.

As our President has said: "There are those who wonder why we have responsibility there * * * we have it for the same reason that we have a responsibility for the defense of Europe."

We are not in Vietnam to establish any American colony or base. We are not there to enrich ourselves or to subjugate others to our will. We are in Vietnam to keep a commitment established by international treaty. We are there because, once again in history, it must be proved to aggressors that the price of their aggression comes far too high.

The aggression we face in Vietnam is not one in which massed armies attack across national frontiers. It is one in which the battlefield is often the homes of men. It is one in which the innocent suffer to the pain of all of us.

The aggression in Vietnam is one which deals in organized assassination and terrorism yet masks itself as a war of liberation. It is waged by hard and callous men who seek to prove that force and Communist militancy can win the future—by men convinced that democratic societies are soft and weak and unable to meet their form of warfare.

To these, we say: Do not be misled. Do not misunderstand the processes of a free society. Do not mistake our respect for the right of dissent for internal division or lack of resolve.

We will remain in Vietnam until a just and lasting peace can be established there. At the same time we shall now—and after establishment of that peace—dedicate ourselves to creating conditions which will enable all the people of Vietnam, North and South, and all of southeast Asia to look forward to a tomorrow without danger of attack, without hunger, and with social justice and security.

There are times when American power must be used—when there is no alternative in face of determined aggression. But military power alone will not provide stability and security unless it is accompanied by political, social, and economic effort—and the promise to the people of a better life. And thus we work with the Vietnamese people toward that goal.

No, peace will not come through military victory alone. Nor will peace come by good intention. Peace comes to those who earn it—work for it—sacrifice for it.

Peace will be won only through the untiring practical efforts of this generation and others to follow—efforts to improve the conditions of man's life. It will be won only when all men realize that they share a common destiny on this planet. Peace will be won when starvation, ignorance, and injustice are eradicated from a world which has the resources to defeat them. There is no alternative to peace. Let us pursue it with perseverance and patience.

Four years ago John Kennedy stood in this place to give this message:

"There is no way to maintain the frontiers of freedom without cost and commitment and risk. There is no swift and easy path to peace in our generation. We cannot save ourselves by abandoning those who are associated with us, or rejecting our responsibilities."

Today his body lies in this place among others who have given their lives so that this lesson might be clear. Today that lesson is not lost.

Let us prepare ourselves for long and hard burdens ahead. Let it be written in history that in this time the lessons of history were heeded.

Today we heed the words of Lincoln, who hated war but waged it for the cause he knew was just:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

Let it be written that, when man's freedom was threatened, there were freemen willing to give their lives to preserve it.

GENERAL GRUENTHER, A DISTINGUISHED NEBRASKAN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening of this week, the Nebraska Society of Washington presented its annual Distinguished Nebraskan Award to Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, U.S. Army, retired, the illustrious former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and later president of the American National Red Cross.

The presentation was made by our colleague, Senator CURTIS, who is retiring after 3 years as a member of the Nebraska Society's board of governors. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of those remarks printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

It is unfortunate that we do not have a copy of General Gruenther's extemporaneous response. It was witty, modest, and charming, as is the man who made it.

All Nebraskans share a great pride in General Gruenther and in his titanic contributions to the cause of peace. This dedicated soldier-humanitarian heightened that pride when he told us he always has and always will regard himself as a Nebraskan.

We were pleased, too, Mr. President to have a number of congratulatory messages sent to the president of our society, Mr. Kimon T. Karabatsos. I ask unanimous consent to have two of them, one from former President Eisenhower and one from Governor Morrison of Nebraska, printed in the RECORD following Senator CURTIS' splendid salute to General Gruenther.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO GEN. ALFRED M. GRUENTHER ON THE OCCASION OF THE AWARD DINNER OF THE NEBRASKA STATE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON BY SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS, JANUARY 26, 1966

We are here to pay respectful tribute to a man who has earned the right to be called an outstanding American. As native sons of Nebraska, we are here to honor a great Nebraskan.

You have no doubt noticed, as I have, that men of high ability are seldom, if ever, one-track men. Though they carve distinguished careers in one field, they show extraordinary talents in many others. Sometimes they

achieve top rank in one career after another. And, sometimes, as with our honored guest this evening, they manage several diversified careers—almost at one time—with no apparent strain.

It would be easy, at this point, to tell you that our guest was born in Platte Center, Nebr., in 1899, and then rattle off, in rapid succession the events and remarkable achievements which have marked his life. But somehow I feel that would not give you a true picture of the man. We will come closer to getting a three-dimensional view if, instead, we take a brief look at one or two incidents in each of the five careers which he has made for himself, simultaneously, or in rapid succession.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, the man we honor tonight, was born in Platte Center in 1899. I've been told that he carries in his pocket a silver dollar, minted in that year. Though why anyone with his phenomenal memory should need a reminder, I wouldn't know.

This fantastic memory, plus the keen intellect and facility for intense concentration which accompany it, are the combination which has helped General Gruenther in everything he has undertaken. The effect of this powerful combination was first demonstrated when he was graduated from West Point, fourth in his class, at the age of 18.

In times of peace and prosperity, it is not easy for even the finest junior officer to find rapid advancement. But Lieutenant Gruenther, who had married Grace Elizabeth Crum, of Jeffersonville, Ind., had an idea for supplementing his less than generous military income. He acquired a manual on how to play bridge. Soon he was recognized as one of the Nation's finest amateur players. And soon he was arranging and refereeing bridge matches, an activity which helped to provide for his wife and two sons. General Gruenther has retained his early skill at bridge, a talent which might have led some men to a professional career. General Gruenther, on the other hand, seems quite content to be the favorite partner of his longtime friend, general, and later President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

General Gruenther's second career began with the rumblings of World War II. In October 1941, Lieutenant Colonel Gruenther was named deputy chief of staff of the 3d Army. Brig. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower was chief of staff. Within months, Colonel Gruenther succeeded his friend as chief of staff of the 3d Army and within a year was again a deputy chief of staff, this time to General Eisenhower at Allied Command Headquarters, Europe.

In these assignments, and his final wartime post as chief of staff for Gen. Mark Clark's 5th Army, General Gruenther built an enviable reputation. Through his consummate skill in organization, his ability to foresee situations and his meticulous attention to detail in seeing that orders were carried out, he was both recognized and rewarded as the perfect staff officer. While he was, as yet, little known outside the military, inside he was already becoming known as the possessor of one of the greatest minds in the Army. By war's end, in 1945, he was the youngest of all the major generals.

Stage three concerns a new career—General Gruenther the planner. After 2 years as Deputy Commandant of the National War College, the general was appointed director of the joint staff which served as the working force of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the preparation of strategic and logistic plans for the Armed Forces.

During this period and in the 2 years between 1949 and 1951 when he served as Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans at Army Headquarters, most of the plans actually put in practice by the Army passed through his hands for approval.

When General Gruenther was appointed, Chief of Staff of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Powers in Europe, it appeared, as it had several times in the past, that he was destined to remain the smart, capable, and highly efficient No. 2 man on whom every commanding officer could depend without question. But that limited horizon, too, was soon to be broadened. In July 1953, he succeeded Gen. Matthew Ridgway as Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and commander in chief of the U.S. European Command. So began career No. 4.

Upon the shoulders of a supreme commander of allied forces rest many burdens, not the least of which is the task of maintaining good relations with dignitaries of many stripes. On one such occasion, General Gruenther put his fantastic memory to good use.

During a visit they had made to Allied headquarters, the general had met, quite casually, 180 members of the British Parliament. As things developed, it became necessary for General Gruenther to visit the House of Commons. In typical fashion, he included in his preparations an hour's study of the names and photographs of all 180 of the members he had met. When he arrived at Westminster, he recognized them all, addressed each one by name as he shook hands, and even made a few personal inquiries about their families.

Not too long after this incident in Commons, it was announced that President Eisenhower would pay a 1-hour visit to Allied headquarters in the near future for a conference. The subjects to be discussed were listed. Although it had no place on the list, General Gruenther immediately directed his staff to compile a chart showing the location of every unit, squad, and individual serviceman in the whole command.

The President arrived, the conference began. After about 50 minutes the listed subjects had been discussed. There was a brief pause. The President broke the silence by asking the distribution of the forces—the staff officer, the planner, the supreme commander was ready. It was this kind of keenness and foresight that led Lord Ismay to call him "the greatest soldier-statesman I have met."

After 39 years of tremendous achievement you might think that General Gruenther would feel as Gen. George Marshall once put it, "I want to go and sit in a chair on my front porch. In about 6 or 8 weeks I'll begin to rock a little." But not General Gruenther—he was still looking for action and he found it.

There is an old adage among athletic coaches: "It's a lot easier to make a fine runner out of a boxer than it is to make a runner into a fine boxer." I submit that it is easier to make a great humanitarian out of a soldier than it is to make a fine soldier out of a humanitarian, especially when you are referring to our friend from Nebraska.

On January 1, 1958, the day after he retired from the Army, General Gruenther—with all the enthusiasm, fire and concentration he had demonstrated in the military—became the president of the American National Red Cross, and career No. 5 was born.

From the end of World War II to 1957 the trend in voluntary contributions to the Red Cross and other organizations had been slowly, but steadily downward. With a larger population to serve in the face of rising costs, the Red Cross needed to reverse that trend. As always, it didn't take the general long to catch on. He soon became convinced that one of his principal missions in his new post was to tell the Red Cross story to people—lots of people. And he did just that.

In a little over 7 years—in addition to all his other administrative duties—General Gruenther crossed this country scores of times, visited Africa once, the Far East three

times, South America three times, and Europe seven times, spreading the word wherever he went. All together he traveled about 700,000 miles and made more than 800 major addresses.

I'm sure by now you have guessed the result. Beginning in 1958, contributions to the Red Cross began to increase—and I'm happy to say they have continued to improve every year since. To tell you the truth, I don't think they would have dared to do anything else.

General Gruenther has been decorated by many nations including his own. He has been similarly honored by Red Cross societies of at least 9 nations and he has received honorary degrees from no fewer than 25 colleges and universities.

We know nothing of what new career and what new honors may await him in the future, but I can say with certainty that no recognition he ever receives will carry with it more true admiration, greater respect, or warmer affection than that he receives from all of us tonight.

GETTYSBURG, PA.,
December 29, 1965.

Mr. KIMON T. KARABATSOS,
Velsicol Chemical Corp.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KARABATSOS: I have been informed by Senators HRUSKA and CURTIS that the Nebraska State Society of Washington is honoring my friend, Gen. Alfred Gruenther, with its annual Distinguished Nebraskan Award. Although it is impossible for me to attend the ceremony at which your society is presenting the award, I do want to join you, by means of this letter, in paying tribute to Alfred Gruenther.

In war and peace he has served his country in important posts, brilliantly, selflessly, and effectively. Joining the Army during World War I, he early established a record for efficiency that caused him to be classed among the most promising officers in the service. He fully lived up to the promise and in his final post, as commander in chief of military forces of NATO, he established an international reputation for fairness, integrity, and a profound understanding that commanded the admiration of both European and American governments.

On such a subject I could write volumes; possibly I should content myself with saying that in every position in which he has served he has established standards that no other has exceeded.

He is my intimate friend and I hope that at the dinner you will extend to him my warm personal greetings and my felicitations that he is to receive the award you are now giving him.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

P.S.—He is also a fair kind of bridge player and is the world's champion at revoking.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,

Lincoln, Nebr., January 26, 1966.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, distinguished Nebraskan: Your native State of Nebraska, always humbly proud of the meaningful influences for good which have been exerted by its many illustrious sons and daughters, is honored with you in your designation as a distinguished Nebraskan by the Nebraska State Society of Washington, D.C.

I am confident that your selection, gratifying though it may be to you, is a source of similar satisfaction, not only to all of your fellow Nebraskans, but also to all of those men and women of our Armed Forces who served with you in meeting the great responsibilities you encountered in your steady ascent up the stairway of service to your countrymen.

It must also be a source of high pleasure to those citizens of the nine foreign coun-

1228

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

January 27, 1966

Alaska villages. Its value is more than an appraisal of its permanent buildings and downtown land. As such, a decision as to whether the riverbanks should be protected to save the community seems outside the bounds of normal cost-benefit ratios established by the Corps of Engineers. Here is one project the special commission could undertake immediately. There are doubtless others similar in nature.

These are suggestions for a commission agenda. Together they would spell an end to the patronizing, paternalistic relationship that exists today and has existed for decades between the native and his Government. Federal help, yes. But Federal help designed to permit him to be self-reliant.

Until that occurs—until the native has opportunities for education, employment, and leadership equal to his paper rights—he will not be free.

He will be trapped on an invisible reservation, a reservation where he can remain alive but never has a chance to live.

It does not have to be that way. The Alaska native has too noble a heritage to be considered less than equal. He is too close to spanning the gap between cultures to endure the present situation much longer. Now is the time for action.

That's the way we, the staff of the Anchorage Daily News, see it.

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER KY BEFORE VIETNAM ARMED FORCES CONGRESS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague, Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, for inserting into the RECORD the text of the important speech presented by Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky to the closing session of the Vietnam Armed Forces Congress on January 15, 1966.

Far from being a "tinhorn Asian dictator" as some Members of this body have unfairly characterized him, the Prime Minister of South Vietnam has proven himself a thoughtful and forceful leader.

Prime Minister Ky does not engage in wishful thinking in this speech. He recognizes the difficulties ahead, and is mindful of the areas of failure during the previous 200 days of his administration.

Yet his speech is an optimistic one precisely because his administration has achieved notable gains in many areas. He points out that in contrast to the military situation of 1 year ago, "allied troops have completely in hand the initiative of operations at every battlefront, and the tide of the war has turned in our favor."

General Ky is aware that the battle in Vietnam is not a military one alone.

Three rural electrification pilot cooperatives were established in Tuyen Duc, AF Giang, and Duc Tu.

Four hundred taxicabs and 200 tri-lambrettas were imported in part of the government program to sell these vehicles on an installment basis to the drivers. A number of construction projects are now underway, and the public works and communications department built 554 single-story housing units at Vinh Hoi and Tan Qui Dong alone.

Nearly 460,434 refugees have been resettled and an educational reform movement has been launched. General Ky states:

As another evidence of the government's efforts in the rural education field, outstanding students from low-income families will be granted official scholarships thus enabling worthy students to complete their secondary education.

As his goals the Prime Minister calls for the defeat of the Vietcong, a stabilization of the economic situation and the building of democracy. A democracy building council will soon be set up, and plans for free elections have been made.

Those who idly compare General Ky and his government with the tyranny he opposes are misreading history. It is time to make clear that although the South Vietnamese Government at this time may not be as strong or as representative or as democratic as we hope it will eventually be, that there will never be any hope of a free and democratic South Vietnam if communism is imposed upon the Vietnamese people.

There is no chance for a free election under communism, and there will be no land reform under communism, and no economic improvement for the people. There will simply be a brutal tyranny.

General Ky provides us with hope and a substantial record of achievement thus far. I, too, commend his words to the consideration of my colleagues.

BOB HOPE—NATIONAL TREASURE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, because of his continued and patriotic unselfishness over the Christmas holidays for a number of years, and the happiness he has brought to millions of people, in this country and all over the world, Bob Hope could well be the most popular man on earth.

Millions of young Americans will never forget the happiness of laughing with him while they were serving overseas; and as those who watched his show from South Vietnam the other evening saw, he can also be wise in serious comment.

All this was either well said or implied in a recent editorial in the Kansas City Star "Bob Hope Goes to War Again."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOB HOPE GOES TO WAR AGAIN

Bob Hope kept seeing familiar faces during his Christmas visit to U.S. servicemen in Vietnam. The combat forces include many an oldtimer who, like Hope, is a veteran of three wars. At Da Nang the marine commander, Maj. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, remarked: "This is the third battlefield I've had the pleasure of meeting Bob Hope on." The other meetings were during World War II and in Korea.

We suppose that many a young American in Vietnam who wrote home about seeing the Hope troupe perform at Christmastime was not even born when his own father laughed at Bob's quips overseas during the Second World War. For 25 years the amazingly indefatigable Hope has been entertaining the troops. Every year brings another exhausting tour—Greenland, Berlin, Guantanamo, the Far East. Hope is as regular as Santa Claus, and funnier.

The man is a national treasure, bless him.

REPORT ON VIETNAM BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, on both of which committees I have the honor to serve, with respect to my trip to South Vietnam, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Attached is a 122-page report of my 10-day visit to South Vietnam, December 28-January 6 inclusive. I was accompanied by Lt. Col. Edward Peter, Army Legislative Liaison.

Also attached is a statement made upon my return January 10; plus a statement about the Central Intelligence Agency made on the floor January 14.

The table of contents summarizes the places visited, including a visit to Thailand.

In a previous visit the first part of December, as a member of the Eugene Black party incident to the signing of the Asian Development Bank agreement in Manila, I also went to Thailand, where I had two additional days with the Ambassador, the Central Intelligence people, and the military, visiting various bases incident to the functions of the latter.

On this first trip I also visited Japan; and in addition, the Philippines, Guam (from which the current B-52 strikes originate) and Hawaii.

In the latter State I was briefed by CINCPAC; also spent a day watching the realistic and effective training of the 25th Division in the mountains of Hawaii. Part of that division is now in South Vietnam.

Starting with Colonel Peter from Hawaii, we again visited Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan, Hong Kong and the United Arab Republic. A report on our visit to these countries is nearly completed and will be sent to you shortly.

In each country we discussed at length the international aspects of our current policies and programs with the U.S. Ambassadors and/or Ministers, with the representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency, and with the military; also with members of the other government in question.

Then we decided to fly back, rather than have the sharp edges of our impressions blurred by visits previously planned to Turkey, Naples, Germany, NATO in Paris, and Great Britain.

I am sending the attached report to the Defense Department, asking that as much as possible be declassified for publication.

Because so much has already been spoken and written about our past, present, and possible future actions in South Vietnam, it was felt that a day-to-day account of our activities might be the better way to make a report. Certain conclusions based on our findings, however, are listed as follows:

Cooperation and understanding between the services is excellent.

Representation of this Government by Ambassador Lodge is of the highest caliber. He is universally respected by the South Vietnamese Government as well as by our own civilian and military leaders.

General Westmoreland is handling the military operations in the highest tradition of the armed services. He also was a wise

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1227

few native ghettos and no government complex to wall off the two cultures.

And some have succeeded in integrating fully into the new life:

Ralph Perdue, president of the Tanana Chiefs Council and owner of a Fairbanks jewelry store.

Emil Notti, president of the Cook Inlet Native Association and electronics engineer for the Bureau of Land Management.

Roy Snyder, currently station mechanic foreman for the Federal Aviation Agency in Nome. A daughter is a practicing physician.

Flory Lekano, a BIA schoolteacher, now assigned to Unalakleet. He has a master's degree in education.

Parker Nation, who grew up in a mission at Nenana and now works as a mechanic for the Federal Aviation Agency at Anchorage.

Walter Riley, who grew up at the same mission and is a truckdriver at Fort Richardson.

Gene Williams is a graduate of the University of Washington and now works at the Alaska Native Medical Center at Anchorage.

These and other natives have managed to carve a place for themselves in a largely nonnative society. They represent a growing middle class; people who can hold their own and speak their minds.

More and more, the native is speaking for himself.

The role and place of Alaska's native people in the State must be better understood—by native and nonnative alike, according to Gov. William Egan.

"They (the village people) must be treated as equal citizens of the State—equal in intelligence and ability," the Governor said.

It is needful, Egan said, that all Alaskans respect the capabilities of the native people and work toward building their confidence in their ability to operate their own projects without "somebody standing over them."

Egan said there is no question in his mind that the State could do a better job of operating schools for its native children than the Federal Government.

He stressed the "differences" that are fostered and continued under two separate programs of education, health and other services.

"The sooner the State can assume full responsibility for the education of all of its children, the better off 'all of us are going to be,' Egan said.

He said the State is moving toward the takeover of additional Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Egan said he authorized that approximately 15 more such schools would come under State direction by the end of 1967.

Such a takeover is mainly a matter of financing, he said.

He said he is in favor of the Federal Government turning over annually to the State those funds it now uses to operate its programs.

Egan said he did not know of any other part of the country where such a program is in operation.

"The time has come, I think," the Governor added, "that a down-to-earth approach must be made in recognizing that all the citizens of the United States have an obligation to the people who live in the villages in the matter of education, welfare and health."

The Governor expressed the view that the series "The Village People," running in the Anchorage Daily News, takes an objective approach to the problem of the native.

"It reaches right down into the heart of the thing," Egan said.

PART 11. THE FUTURE

Yesterday's installment of "The Village People" was the last in the series.

No. 12—6

What follows should not be considered a presentation of facts, but rather a presentation of opinion—the collective opinion of members of the Anchorage Daily News editorial staff.

It had not been our intention to conclude this series with recommendations. Our purpose has been to inform our readers about the Alaska native. He represents one-fourth the civilian population of Alaska. And he is rarely heard from.

But after months of study, travel, and conservation, we have formed some opinions and ideas. These we must publish also.

Most of Alaska's 50,000 Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians live in the villages. Some areas, some villages, are advancing under their own power. But the vast majority are not, particularly on the western coast and in the interior.

The population is increasing rapidly in an area where subsistence living—the historic life of the north—is consistently more difficult. The native can no longer live in the old way. And as he and his children become more acquainted with modern civilization, the old way no longer seems desirable.

In these areas poverty is a way of life—perhaps as deeply embedded as in any place under the American flag. Welfare checks take the place of jobs. Though there are schools, educational achievement remains low. Alcohol and tuberculosis take a tremendous toll. Most homes are substandard. There is a high expectancy of failure among the population.

This condition, it seems to us, is a national blind spot. For decades the Federal Government has been in the villages with schools and nurses and social workers. What exists today is self-evident proof that the present system is not sufficient. Decades of good intentions have not produced notable results. It eventually could be one of our greatest international embarrassments.

It does not seem to us that the problem is beyond solution or that any solution need be thought of in terms of generations. And it is not enough to say that the people that must help themselves. The native people of Alaska have been among the most self-reliant on earth—their climate and way of life demanded it. What they lack now are the tools for becoming self-reliant in the new culture.

Historically the Bureau of Indian Affairs has administered to the Alaska native. It has provided his education, welfare, store loans, and other necessities. But no native leader today fails to be critical of the BIA. Among the people it is designed to serve, it apparently is discredited.

Something else is needed, probably the State of Alaska, which is moving slowly into the realm of native affairs—a transfer of power which generally draws native acceptance.

For the present, however, the State is finding it difficult to assume too large an economic burden in this respect. And some needs will be beyond the State's power to fulfill for years to come.

When the full transfer comes, the house should be in order. The only power to accomplish that now exists at the Federal level.

We believe that nothing less is required, immediately, than a Presidential commission for the Alaska native. Such a commission should be headed by a nationally respected figure. It should look at the record, talk to the native people, and transcend the authority of existing agencies to set up machinery for the restoration of the Alaska native to a place of equality and dignity.

There is precedent for it. After the March 1964 earthquake, the President organized a special reconstruction commission headed by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

The Commission was ably staffed and went to work with determination. Because of it, agency lines were erased, bills were passed by Congress, and most recovery efforts—half a billion dollars worth—were accomplished rapidly.

That is what is needed for the Alaska native.

Here are some of the things such a commission could achieve:

Jobs: The U.S. Government is the primary employer of people in the Alaska bush country. Yet many of its most attractive jobs are beyond the reach of people in the area. Employees for the FAA or Weather Bureau or other installations are hired elsewhere, trained elsewhere, and sent to an Alaska outpost for temporary hardship duty. It is not inconceivable that local people could be hired, trained elsewhere, and returned home to permanent employment at no increased cost. By altering hiring practices, it seems that the U.S. Government could be a better employer of local people. It is certainly an area the State should consider, too. Alaska often speaks of its special situation in relation to other States. It should also recognize special situations within its borders.

The total problem will never be solved until the area has a sufficient economic base. By building roads and harbors in selected areas it would be possible to tap the natural resources of the regions involved and influence future development.

Education: The State should take over administration of all rural schools at the earliest possible time. This commission could help speed up the timetable by working out a program for financing this transfer.

A program for training native students to be teachers in their home villages or village area could be established. And if this required a reduction in minimum standards to be effective immediately, it seems that the benefits—having a person who understands the culture and the problems and who can be an example to the people—outweigh this consideration.

Land: A commission of this type could arrange for settling the longstanding Alaska land problem.

Birth control: This commission could do for the Alaska native what the United States is doing for underdeveloped nations of the world—provide information and assistance in birth control. No such program exists today for the Alaska native, whose birth rate is the highest in the world.

Housing: In some villages people who have good jobs cannot secure loans for home construction because the home—without water and sewage—would not meet FHA standards. In other villages few have jobs and live huddled together—perhaps a dozen to a house—in one room. There is a Federal housing program for virtually everyone in the United States except the Alaska native. Senator BARTLETT has introduced legislation in Congress to correct this situation. The commission could give this measure significant backing.

Tourism: There is a tremendous potential for the Alaska native in Alaska's growing tourist industry. But he needs help in marketing his arts and crafts. The commission here could be of immediate assistance.

Welfare: While we did not survey the native welfare program closely enough to form hard and fast judgments, there are indications that it works against self-reliance, discourages natives from securing temporary jobs and encourages larger families, whether or not the mother is married. This program should be carefully reviewed to see whether the stated aims of the programs are being achieved.

Projects: Bethel is the economic, transportation, cultural, health, and communications center for 15,000 people in southwest

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1229

choice, especially because of his intense interest in the problems of the South Vietnamese civilians.

Morale in the military is high. Unless our mission becomes more clear, however, this might not continue at the same high level among lower echelons.

There are logistic shortages, some serious but none critical; and there has been a marked improvement in that condition during recent weeks. The future of adequate supplying depends primarily upon (a) the ability to improve the unloading of ships at the various ports and (b) the nature and degree of the planned buildup.

Once more, there is a clear demonstration of the vital importance of air power. The C-130 is literally priceless in a country with practically no railroad capacity and so many at least periodically interdicted roads. It is difficult to visualize today how past military operations were ever conducted without helicopters.

Air operations in South Vietnam in support of ground troops have been effective; in fact, no one believes the present operations could have been conducted at all without this air power (naval air strength and Army air strength are of course included).

Air operations against North Vietnam have been relatively ineffective to the point where these operations should not be resumed unless there is more target license; license to hit such military targets as powerplants, oil stores, docks, and so forth.

The long coastline of Vietnam gives full opportunity for utilization of our superior naval power. That superiority, however, is not being adequately utilized.

There should be programs to reduce, if not eliminate, the sanctuary aspects of Laos and Cambodia. Both countries are being utilized by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese to transport men and equipment to South Vietnam; and also as sanctuaries. In both countries there are Communist headquarters.

The current limited military operations are very expensive and can only become steadily more expensive. The United States is carrying this economic load with little assistance from any nation of the free world, and no assistance from most. These other countries should assume more of this cost in manpower and money.

Those who urge greater effort on the part of this administration to attain peace at the conference table—plus continued cessation of military effort—generally acknowledge that they are not suggesting the United States withdraw from South Vietnam.

In a world telescoped in time and space to the point where "every country is now in the next county," one in which "spheres of influence" is now a relatively obsolete term, these statements promote an unwillingness to negotiate, because others interpret in them a weakening of the will of this Nation to carry on the struggle.

If South Vietnam is not the right place to defend the free world against totalitarian aggression, we should retire from that country on the best terms possible. This would probably result in a Communist takeover of additional countries and would damage seriously the world position and status of the United States. That would be the price, but it would not be catastrophic.

If South Vietnam is the right place to defend the free world against totalitarian aggression, however, then that fact should be recognized in more practical fashion. We cannot continue indefinitely the plans and programs incident to the current holding operation. After 25 years of almost continuous war, the South Vietnamese have lost much of the best of their manhood. They are tired and the gigantic cost to us is also very costly to them.

This conflict constitutes the fourth time in 20 years that the United States accepted

the splitting of the boundaries of a country; and then remained to bear most if not all of the cost—billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of people. Regardless of the wisdom of those decisions, the effect on our economy is inescapable.

In the current conflict we conscientiously consider how our moves may affect the actions of the Red Chinese. At times it would seem there is undue preoccupation with this question and it is fair to ask whether this strengthens or weakens our capacity for decision. If the latter is true, how much more so will it be true when a few years hence China becomes a nuclear power?

The time is approaching when we must decide—while the decision is still ours to make—whether we will move forward or move out. Whichever course we choose, we must take it with courage, with skill, and with realism. We must be equally realistic about the consequences of avoiding this difficult choice.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

SYMINGTON PREPARING REPORT ON TRIP TO VIETNAM AND PACIFIC AREAS

WASHINGTON, January 10.—Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, who returned to Washington last night following 6 weeks in the Pacific area, including an intensive 10 days in South Vietnam, started working today on a report he will file with the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. He is a member of both committees.

Commenting about his visit to Vietnam, SYMINGTON said: "Certain conclusions stand out—the high caliber and morale of our American representatives, civilian as well as military; the magnificent cooperation between the services, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, plus the great respect they have for each other; the improved cooperation and understanding, at all levels, under the leadership of General Ky and Ambassador Lodge, between the representatives of the Government of South Vietnam and our representatives."

The Missouri Senator said he planned to withhold further comment on Vietnam until completing his report for the committees.

Since Thanksgiving, SYMINGTON has visited foreign and U.S. officials and military missions not only in South Vietnam but also in Japan, Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, Okinawa, Taiwan and Hong Kong, Guam, Hawaii and Alaska.

In Vietnam, SYMINGTON's inquiry included numerous trips in the field. He met with key commanders, combat troops, combat support and service units and also visited with U.S. servicemen in the hospitals. SYMINGTON arrived in Saigon on Tuesday morning, December 28, and left there Thursday afternoon, January 6.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

During my recent trip abroad, I was afforded the opportunity of looking over the programs and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in many countries. Prior to departure, I received extensive briefings from the Agency and during my trip talked in detail with all Agency representatives in the country in question, as has been my custom in past years when visiting abroad.

All felt the latter's programs were fully coordinated with United States policy of the Agency with every Ambassador. In every case, no exception, the Ambassador expressed his complete approval of the functioning of the Agency.

I found no instances of any kind where CIA activities were uncontrolled, or contrary to United States policy. Indeed it would appear difficult, if not impossible, for such uncontrolled activities to occur. This belief is based on existing coordination procedures and policy directives stemming from

the Washington level, plus the controls applicable to field activities.

I have always been impressed, in my contacts with the Agency, with the integrity and professional competence of its representatives. Only twice, in over 10 years, have I found anything to the contrary. Based on the present rules, I doubt if those cases of disagreement could now be duplicated.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to present to the Senate the fact that I agree with Secretary Rusk who, in talking about CIA people, stated: "There is a good deal of gallantry and a high degree of competence in those who have to help us deal with that part of the struggle for freedom."

The Central Intelligence Agency has a difficult, and at times a very dangerous mission to perform. Not all men, or women, of this or any other agency, are perfect, and it is easy to criticize any group which cannot defend itself because of the nature of its work. Nevertheless it is my considered judgment that the American public should be proud of this organization and its people, a group who serve our country with unstinting devotion.

In addition to this brief report, which of necessity must be general, I am also reporting my findings and conclusions in more detail to Chairman RUSSELL and the Subcommittee for the CIA of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

SKI RESORTS OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, New Mexico has many assets, and one of them that is little-known is its outstanding ski resorts. Alex Katz, a reporter for the Chicago Sun-Times, visited several of our winter resorts recently and came back filled with praise for what he found.

I ask unanimous consent that his report to the readers of the Sun-Times be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Jan. 21, 1966]

NEW MEXICO AREAS RISING AS TOP SKI RESORTS

(By Alex Katz)

SANTE FE, N. MEX.—In the minds of most Americans, New Mexico's image is one of glaring deserts and Indians who live in pueblos and sell silver jewelry to tourists.

But to a growing number of knowledgeable winter sports enthusiasts, New Mexico is becoming a skier's paradise without crowded slopes and long lift lines.

For years New Mexico's Department of Development has plugged the State's sunshine and climate. The sunshine and climate haven't changed, of course, but now attention is being given to snow-covered peaks that soar to 13,000 feet and the skiers they attract.

TOUGH SKI RUNS

Some of the toughest ski runs in the Nation can be found at Taos Ski Valley, 18 miles northeast of the famed artists' town of Taos.

This season Ernie Blake, the hard-working Swiss who operates Taos Ski Valley, installed a second double chair lift. The addition of this chair lift, 3,400 feet long, virtually doubles the amount of skiable terrain.

And what terrain!

A huge bowl, certain to afford excellent protected skiing all winter and into late spring is now accessible with the new lift.

On a tour of the bowl last week, this writer watched Blake thrust a ski pole, handle first, into the snow to record its depth. The 52-inch pole sank almost out of sight.

The headwall that rises above the bowl is something only experts should try. A few skiers have already offered a selection of names for the brute. Among them: Tucker-man's West, Reforma, and Kamikaze.

SOME CHANGES

Elsewhere in Taos Ski Valley, changes are being made. The new ski shop handles rentals and sales without a hitch. Down the road a condominium apartment building is being built to ease the housing demands and another is planned for next season at a spot directly above the beginners' area.

The Blake version of the United Nations continues to appeal to skiers who have learned that Taos Ski Valley offers a cosmopolitan approach to the sport. Five nations—the United States, Switzerland, France, Finland, and Germany—are represented in the 16-man ski school.

Only recently the State approved the establishment of the Taos Air Taxi which offers speedy flight service to Taos for skiers arriving at Albuquerque's new Sunport via Trans World Airlines jets.

Just 16 miles from Santa Fe, the oldest State capital in the Nation, is Santa Fe Ski Basin. Texans and Oklahomans in great numbers have discovered the pleasure of skiing at Santa Fe Ski Basin and enjoying the comforts of the accommodations in the nearby city.

Plans are underway for the construction of a lodge at the ski development.

EXTENDED SEASON

The base at Santa Fe Ski Basin is at an altitude of about 10,000 feet, assuring good snow conditions for an extended season. Four lifts serve the area: two double chair lifts and two Poma lifts. Eleven major trails are spread across the slopes which have a vertical drop of up to 1,700 feet.

Harvey Chalker, well-known to Chicago ski show visitors, is manager of the area. Kingsbury Pitcher, veteran in the field of ski area management, operates the ski development. A ski school with certified instructors is on duty daily and is augmented by a corps of associate certified teachers on weekends.

Residents of the booming city of Albuquerque merely have to drive 18 miles northeast to ski at Sandia Peak. A double chair lift soars 7,600 feet along the spine of this enormous mountain.

Better skiers will enjoy the Exhibition run, so named because it is directly below the chair lift line where every rider can check the style and technique of fellow skiers.

Most of the skiing at Sandia Peak will suit intermediates. The vertical drop on the Exhibition, Aspen, and Cibola runs is 1,750 feet.

SANDIA'S 30TH YEAR

This is Sandia Peak's 30th year of operation, and the highlight of the celebration should come in March when an aerial tramway, 2.7 miles long, is expected to go into operation.

The tramway will have two 60-passenger cars and will take skiers from the valley to the top of the ski area in only 10 minutes.

Three of the four major cables to carry the cars are in place. The fourth is ready for stringing with the aid of a helicopter.

A view from the top of Sandia Peak affords a spectacular glimpse of several mountain ranges, the city of Albuquerque, and the Rio Grande. The tram will operate all year.

Other ski areas in New Mexico include Red River, Sipapu, Raton, Sierra Blanca, and Cloudcroft. The skiing is excellent. The only problem is getting skiers to believe it.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, this year the President's Economic Report is able to present the welcome news that American agriculture is sharing fully in

the great economic advance of the Nation's economy. One remarkable statistic sums up this progress: Last year, 1965, the net income of farm proprietors advanced by 23 percent. Rarely in our past history have farmers made that kind of progress in a single year.

The average net income of farmers is the most appropriate measure of farm prosperity. Gross farm income in billions of dollars pays no attention to the costs farmers incur in producing this gross income, nor to the number of farmers who must share in it. The old parity price ratios that used to be taken as a guide to farm prosperity pay no attention to the increase in farm productivity.

Agricultural policy is one of the most complex problems that this Nation or any nation faces. I say "any nation," because the United States is not alone in recognizing that its farm sector has special problems, and that the prosperity of agriculture cannot be left completely to the mechanical operation of a free market.

American farm policy, however, has clearly been moving in new directions—successful directions. Success is shown by the rise in farm incomes. And success is shown by the significant reduction in our surplus stocks of farm products. Judging by these results I should say that our farm policies are finally on the right track.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14 (b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703 (b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and suggest that the staff be notified that it will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 15 Leg.]		
Aiken	Holland	Muskie
Allott	Inouye	Neuberger
Bartlett	Jackson	Proxmire
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Dominick	Mansfield	Talmadge
Douglas	McClellan	Thurmond
Gruening	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hayden	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DODD, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is recognized.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator if I may do so without losing my rights to the floor and without the resumption of my speech being considered a second speech on the pending subject matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1231

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance in the Senate from now until Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Arkansas yield with the understanding that he shall not lose his rights to the floor and that his subsequent remarks will not be counted as a second speech?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield with that understanding.

THE TRUTH CONCERNING OUR ALLEGED COMMITMENT TO FIGHT A WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the statement is frequently made in the Senate, in the House of Representatives, and elsewhere that the United States is committed to the conflict in Vietnam. Because of this alleged commitment, it is stated we should not withdraw our forces from Vietnam, either withdrawing them altogether or withdrawing them to enclaves on the seacoast. In fact, Republican warhawks in the House of Representatives and militarists such as retired Gen. Curtis LeMay, who are urging acceleration, escalation, and expansion of our fighting in Vietnam by interdicting the port of Haiphong, bombing Hanoi, and even bombing Red China "back into the Stone Age" to quote warhawk former General LeMay, invariably talk about our commitment to defend South Vietnam against Communist aggression.

At this good hour we have approximately 200,000 men of our Armed Forces fighting in the steaming jungles and central highlands and along the coast of South Vietnam, and, in addition, nearly 60,000 men of our 7th Fleet are involved in this war off the South China Sea and our air forces have been bombing North Vietnam from bases in Thailand. We have approximately 30,000 men of our Armed Forces in Thailand.

They always talk of commitments made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy and that we Americans must live up to those commitments. What are the facts? As a trial lawyer for 40 years and as chief criminal prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, many years before becoming a Senator of the United States, I dealt with facts. What commitments did President Eisenhower make? What commitments did President Kennedy make?

Our initial commitment to South Vietnam made by President Eisenhower in 1954 in a letter to the President of South Vietnam stated:

I am instructing the American Ambassador * * * to examine with you * * * how an intelligent program of American aid * * * can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial.

He added:

The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. * * * The U.S. Government hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government.

Can anyone claim that Prime Minister Ky of South Vietnam, who himself was born and reared in Hanoi, heads a strong, viable state? He claims to control only 700 of 2,600 villages in South Vietnam. He could not remain in power 1 month except for the operations of our Central Intelligence Agency and the support of our Armed Forces.

While General Eisenhower was President, the U.S. military advisory group to Vietnam was increased from a total of 327 in 1953 to 685 in 1961.

We have been withholding bombing of North Vietnam since before Christmas. I consider that President Johnson's decision in this particular was, and is, a wise decision. A military surrender to the United States will never produce acceptance of American presence in Asia by most Asiatics. It would be a legacy of ill will which we should not leave to future generations of Americans. Until Asiatics show more interest in defending themselves, then unilateral American involvement in Asia is doomed to failure. The ugly reality is that for the most part it is American GI's who are fighting and dying in Vietnam for the alleged defense of freedom in Asia. Can it be claimed by anyone that we Americans have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world?

Now, having made it crystal clear that President Eisenhower's commitment, so-called, was a very "iffy" commitment indeed, what commitment did the late President John F. Kennedy make?

President Kennedy said on September 3, 1963, shortly before his assassination:

I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort, and, in my opinion, in the last 2 months the government had gotten out of touch with the people.

Also, on another occasion, our late, great President John F. Kennedy said:

Transforming Vietnam into a Western rebound is ridiculous.

Therefore, it is evident that we are not fighting a land war in southeast Asia because of commitments made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

No matter how often we profess our intention to defend freedom in Vietnam, the increasing escalation of the war is raising grave doubts throughout Asia and elsewhere in the world as to the wisdom of our policy. Attacks with sophisticated weapons on unsophisticated and illiterate Asians is building a vast reservoir of anti-Americanism and misunderstanding of our country among the masses of people in Asia.

The primary reason for our being in Vietnam today is our proud refusal to admit a mistake in our attempt to make Vietnam a pro-American and an anti-Communist state. More than anything else, we are fighting to avoid admitting failure. As Walter Lippmann bluntly put it, "We are fighting to save face."

Recently, from September 28 to October 19, I was on an official mission in southeast Asia, being much of that time in Thailand and Vietnam. As stated by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], in a newsletter he writes and distributes as an additional service to his constituents, regarding his observations in Vietnam:

Vietnam is a land of breathtaking sea-coasts, green jungles, fertile rice paddies, picturesque mountains—a lovely Garden of Eden converted into a hell on earth by man's inhumanity to man.

The Senator from South Dakota is so right, and he stated our grim situation over there in very beautiful prose.

The statement frequently made that we are fighting in Vietnam because of the commitments made by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy lacks basis in fact. President Eisenhower's careful statement in 1954, when analyzed, demonstrates there was no commitment. The fact is that in January, when he left the Presidency only 685 military advisers were in Vietnam. This proves that he did not commit our Armed Forces to combat. Very definitely, President Eisenhower made no commitment; and the late President John F. Kennedy very bluntly stated, regarding war in Vietnam, that the people of Vietnam have to win that war against the Communists and in blunt language he gave the lie to those who claim that South Vietnam is strategically important to the defense of the United States. We lose face, Mr. President, by messing around in a civil war in the jungles and highlands in Vietnam.

Before I spent days on inspection trips into every area of South Vietnam, talked with officers and GI's at Air Force bases, witnessed an air strike in the iron triangle, and was briefed in South Vietnam, Thailand, Japan, and elsewhere, I had thought that the Vietcong fighting us in South Vietnam were Communists and infiltrators from the north. I learned that very definitely this is a civil war raging in Vietnam, that a large majority of the Vietcong fighting us are not infiltrators nor Communists from the north but are men born and reared in South Vietnam. Gen. Richard Stillwell stated that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in that area. General Westmoreland stated to me that the bulk of the Vietcong forces fighting in South Vietnam was born and reared in South Vietnam.

It is obvious that the Saigon government of Prime Minister Ky controls less than one-fourth of the entire land area of South Vietnam. Furthermore, it appears that now when we have 200,000 men of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam, the Vietcong control more land area than they did before 1 year ago.

Very definitely, Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States. Very definitely we are involved in a civil war in Vietnam.

It is evident to me that the militarists, including members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and State Secretary Rusk, have been giving our President poor advice. Due to their advice and our bombing of

North Vietnam the very precious lives of many young men piloting our war planes have been snuffed out and airplanes have been destroyed which cost taxpayers large sums of money. Yet, the results are not such as to justify this loss of lives and terrific loss of money due to planes destroyed by enemy action in North Vietnam.

Our President, instead of following poor advice, would be justified in continuing the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. It was shocking to read the report in the Washington Post this morning that 18 of 20 Democratic and Republican leaders who had advised the President yesterday urged that he renew bombing in North Vietnam. He received very poor advice from 18 of those 20 advisers. He would do well to consult with 20 Senators of the United States, picking them at random, and there would be more than 2 of 20, I am sure, who would give him the proper advice.

Furthermore, our President, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, would be well advised if he were to listen and pay attention to the views of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway, former Chief of Staff of our Armed Forces—as a humble major, I served under him at the Anzio beachhead, and over the years I have admired and respected General Ridgeway very much, indeed—and Gen. James M. Gavin who was Chief of U.S. Army Plans and Operations at the time of the French military disaster at Dienbienphu. Both General Gavin and General Ridgeway assert that southeast Asia is the worst place in the world for us to engage in a land operation with hundreds of thousands of American citizens.

Furthermore, regarding the danger that this conflict might be expanded and escalated and that by your actions Communist China might enter into military combat with our forces, General Gavin stated—and incidentally, I was never more than a civilian in uniform during the 37 months I served in World War II, but certainly General Gavin's statement makes sense to anyone:

Manchuria with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its war-making capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged if at all.

This makes sense to any layman. He says continuing bombing of North Vietnam including bombing of Hanoi, the capital, will add to our problems rather than detract from them.

We are in possession of bases on the coast of Vietnam and with our air power and the backing of warships of the 7th Fleet, we are readily able to maintain those bases against any attacks of the Vietcong. The U.S. forces now in Vietnam should continue the bombing pause against North Vietnam, under orders of the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. We should be thankful that the makers of our Constitution provided that in the United States, civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority. Our land forces, Mr. President, should be withdrawn to the coastal bases, and then we should seek to find a solution, through the International Con-

trol Commission, which is composed of representatives from Poland, India, and Canada, or through the United Nations, or by a conference in Geneva or elsewhere.

Historically, there is no such thing as North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The Geneva accords of 1954, which we agreed to, but which our representatives did not sign, stated:

The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

If and when there are negotiations for a cease-fire or armistice, whether those negotiations are held in Geneva or in the military demarcation zone separating what is termed North and South Vietnam, or an Asiatic city, of course delegates representing the Vietcong or National Liberation Front, so-called, must be seated along with delegates of the Hanoi government and delegates of the United States.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas very much for yielding to me.

VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me, under such conditions as he may prescribe?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, upon the same conditions as I have yielded to Senators who have preceded him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from Arkansas.

I should like to commend my friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], for the statement which he has just made on the current situation in Vietnam.

I find myself in complete agreement with the policy recommendations which he has made. I am also in accord with the recent statements of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior member of the Republican Party in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

In my judgment, the national interests of the United States would be best served by not renewing the bombing of North Vietnam at this time.

On January 24, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] stated that he was opposed to the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam by U.S. forces for the foreseeable future.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] stated that there should be an indefinite suspension of such bombings.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] endorsed the foregoing views by stating:

The bombing should be suspended until it becomes perfectly clear that the Communist nations intend to fight the war to a finish.

I believe that I understand in some small degree the agony which the Presi-

dent of the United States is suffering, in being called upon by our constitutional system to make the difficult judgments which involve war or peace.

I have long held the view that the President is entitled to the greatest flexibility in dealing with the situation in Vietnam, and that he should be supported in his peace offensive.

Upon reading the morning newspapers, it now appears that the die is about to be cast, and that the bombings will be resumed.

To me, this is unfortunate, because I believe that every day we are approaching the point of no return in terms of an escalation of the war into a nuclear war—the third world war.

It may be, as Secretary McNamara has stated, that we have the nuclear potential to destroy both China and the Soviet Union in one fell swoop. But even Secretary McNamara agrees that the destruction which would be wreaked upon the United States would be almost without measure.

Consequently, I would hope that we would have less loud talk about our nuclear capability for destroying our adversaries and more careful diplomacy which will result in either a mutual unilateral deescalation of the war, or in the alternative, a reconvening of the Geneva Conference, which would give us an opportunity to sit down and talk with all interested parties.

In this regard, I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Ohio that it is most important that we should be prepared to talk with representatives of the National Liberation Front.

The Secretary of State has stated that the Vietcong represent only a few hundred thousand of the 14 million people in South Vietnam. Nevertheless, they do hold most of the real estate in South Vietnam outside the larger cities. It may be true that a majority of the population does live in the area controlled by the Ky government, but in effect they are close to being confined in those cities because they cannot return to their own villages.

Mr. President, I point out again what the Senator from Ohio has stated both General Westmoreland and General Stilwell told him: that 80 percent of the individuals now fighting with the Vietcong—I believe it is some 263,000—originally came from South Vietnam. Although they are now fighting for what, to me, is a most mistaken cause—in fact, in many ways, a wicked cause—none-theless, it is a cause in which they firmly believe; namely, to liberate their country—and it is their country—from what they believe to be the colonialism of a white Western nation, and also from a government in Saigon which is obviously not a purely democratic government.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know that the Senator finds fault with the Government of South Vietnam, but let me suggest to the Senator that there are many governments that fail to conform to democratic processes. Our Government

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1233

would hope to see a government installed there which would conform to democratic processes, but we are confronted with a choice: someone on our side, or a government which is a brutal, dictatorial regime, and which is communistic.

That is the choice. If we wish to choose communism and help them to take over southeast Asia, we can support that regime, and keep finding fault with the United States by making only slight criticism, or saying something to the effect that, after all, we believe that communism is a bad thing. But, Mr. President, we are going to be confronted with this decision many a time, as between a dictator who is against communism and one who is for communism. Which one do we want?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Louisiana has obviously been an advocate of military dictatorships for some time. It has always been his tactic to accuse those of us who do not favor military dictatorships of being soft on communism. There is nothing which he has said to me which alters that position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think the record will show that I have not been an advocate of military dictatorships. As between two dictators, I would rather be for one who was an anti-Communist rather than for one who was a pro-Communist, because the Communists are trying to destroy us.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entitled to his view, which I regard as rather primitive. I do not agree with him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I will yield in a moment. Let me complete my sentence.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three articles which I believe state far more eloquently than I have been able to do the point of view of which I have expressed. One article is entitled "Military Influence and Viet Choices," published a few days ago in the Washington Post, and written by Marquis Childs; an article by Walter Lippmann, entitled "Well, What Can He Do?" published in the Washington Post of January 25, 1966; and finally, an advertisement which appeared in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer, paid for by a large group of citizens from the City of Brotherly Love, entitled "The Bombing Pause."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

MILITARY INFLUENCE AND VIET CHOICES

(By Marquis Childs)

The ordeal that Lyndon Johnson is now enduring is unique in his experience. He finds himself caught in a situation in which all his extraordinary skill in maneuver and manipulation is of little avail. If the public man breaks out in irritation the reason is plain enough.

He is trying to find a way out of Vietnam that will not mean an enlarged war and the political consequences of committing much greater numbers of Americans on the ground in Vietnam. The score to date is certainly a big E for effort. But he labors under

handicaps that could bring all this effort to naught.

Increasingly during the past year it has become evident that the decisions rest to an ever-larger degree with the military. Inspired reports coming out of Saigon apparently from high-ranking officers cast doubt on the President's peace offensive and hint at the need to resume bombing in the North. In today's war if there were a general of the stature and the dramatic flair of the late Douglas MacArthur, President Johnson might find himself confronted as a result of his restraints in the cause of peace with the kind of challenge that Harry S. Truman faced up to in the Korean war.

Civilian officials in the Pentagon, sharing with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara doubts about the effectiveness of a large commitment of land forces, have watched with growing concern the way in which military dominance seems inevitable in Vietnam decisions. They trace this back to a step taken a year ago. That was when President Johnson ordered a battalion of Hawk missiles into South Vietnam.

Events since then have followed a classic military pattern. If you hold position A then you must also hold position B in order to protect position A. And having moved up to position B you require greatly increased logistical support and eventually, to be entirely secure, you must advance to position C.

The Hawks were introduced following one of the most shocking episodes of the Vietnam conflict. At the end of the truce of the lunar new year a year ago up to 50 Vietcong guerrillas infiltrated Camp Holloway Air Base near Pleiku. With mortar fire they killed 8 Americans, wounded 126 others, destroyed 9 helicopters and a transport plane and severely damaged 11 other planes. Three days later Vietcong terrorists blew up an American military barracks at Quinhon, killing at least 22 of the 40 Americans in the building.

This upcoming bloody anniversary underscores how critical is the present moment in the balance between a possible peace and a larger war. The Vietcong marked the beginning of the current new year truce with a barbarous attack on men, women, and children in a refugee camp. If they should end the truce as they did last year—and this may have happened even before these words are in print—with something like the Pleiku attack, President Johnson would find it hard to continue the present pause in the bombing of North Vietnam.

The Hawks, which the President ordered installed at the same time he authorized bombing in the North, are extraordinary complex weapons capable of firing on the average one surface-to-air missile every 5 seconds. The Marine 1st Light Antiaircraft Battalion at Danang, 380 miles northeast of Saigon, is equipped with six missile launchers each mounting three missiles, five complete radar units, three electronic vans, and seven generators with battery supply units. Meant to protect the big jet base at Danang from air attack, so far as is known they have not yet fired on an enemy plane.

This complex, put down in a primitive country where guerrilla fighters carry their weapons on their backs, points up the case made by the American military for more and more and more. To protect such a vulnerable complex, obviously the perimeter surrounding it must be pushed back to insure against infiltration and mortar fire. Supplying and maintaining such a complex in the hot, humid climate of Vietnam is in itself no small task. The unit's large radar screen covers a 17-mile area and the missile launcher locks onto a target in 3 seconds.

For a man of his temperamental intensity the President has shown remarkable patience. And those who work with him from day to day say that he has never let up on his de-

termination to keep the important decisions in his own hands. Nevertheless, the very scale of the American commitment, as it grows from week to week and month to month, limits his choices.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 1966]

WELL, WHAT CAN HE DO?

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reason why the peace offensive failed is most cogently revealed in the Mansfield report on the state of the war. Mr. Johnson has been trying to obtain by propaganda the victory which he has not been able to obtain on the battlefield—that is to say the acceptance in the whole of South Vietnam of a government which has lost control of a very large part of South Vietnam. The peace offensive was bound to fail, and the grave decisions which the President hoped to circumvent and avoid are now before him.

If he is to make these decisions wisely, he must recognize that in international politics peace settlements are possible only as and when they reflect the real balance of power. In the World War, for example, Churchill and Roosevelt had to settle with Stalin for a Soviet political frontier in the midst of Germany and of Europe. That is where the Red army had arrived when the peace negotiations began. The same principle will hold in Vietnam. There will be no settlement until the terms of peace reflect the military reality.

The President will be disappointed again and again as long as he and Secretary Rusk ask for a settlement which in effect demands that the defeat of the Saigon forces, be transmuted at the conference table into a victory for the Saigon forces. Nor should he indulge in any illusion that the informed opinion of mankind really thinks as Secretary Rusk talks merely because American envoys have been politely and sympathetically received in so many capitals.

What then should the President do? It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

The Mansfield report shows that Mr. Rusk's objective—the rule of General Ky or his successor over the whole of South Vietnam—is unattainable no matter how much the war is escalated. The burden of disproving the conclusions of the Mansfield report is on those who have been proved wrong about the escalation of last summer, on those who are now asking for another escalation in order to redeem their failure, on those who want to redouble the stakes in order to recoup their losses.

If the Mansfield report contains the truth of the matter, it follows inevitably that our war aims should be reduced and our strategy revised. We should put aside the hopeless task of searching out and destroying the Vietcong, and we should take our stand, as General Gavin advises, on a holding operation in the coastal cities.

This is not a policy for a glorious victory or for some kind of dazzling political triumph. It is no trick for pulling rabbits out of a hat. It is a formula for liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tomtoms.

Because we are neither omniscient nor omnipotent, we, even we Americans, cannot

always win. But I cannot help feeling in my bones that a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future.

THE BOMBING PAUSE

(NOTE.—Text of an advertisement which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 27, 1966, with names of sponsors.)

There is no logical limit to the war in Vietnam. If we resume bombing now we are committing ourselves to a war that has already widened into Laos and may widen further into Cambodia and Thailand.

We support the President in his stated purpose that we will negotiate with any group.

We feel that for our current diplomatic effort to gain momentum a pause in bombing of indefinite duration would be indispensable. The dangers of prolonging the pause in bombing cannot be greater than the dangers of resumption.

Now, while the pause in bombing continues, is the time to influence the debate on the war. Write to the President, your Senators and Representatives. This ad was paid for by a group of concerned Pennsylvanians.

Sponsors: Dr. Alexine Atherton, Miss Grace Bohr, Mr. J. Brodie, Mr. Edward Carleton, Jr., Dr. William Davidson, Mrs. Robert DeWitt, Mr. and Mrs. William Dockhorn, Mr. and Mrs. Phillip Edgerton, Miss Abbie Huston Evans, Mrs. Anna Fisher, Mr. and Mrs. G. M. Foley, Mrs. Bernard Friedberg, M.D., Miss Ellen S. Gersh, Dr. and Mrs. Harvey Glickman, Mrs. Peter Goodwin, Dr. Roberta B. Gonzales, M.D., Mrs. Mildred Greenberg, Dr. Marcel Gutwirth, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Hagedorn, Dr. Theodore Hetzel, Dr. Merwin W. Humphrey, Mrs. Jean Hopper, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Huntington, Miss Mary Hoxie Jones, Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Kavalier, Mr. Louis Kay, Mr. and Mrs. James N. Kise, Mr. Michael Lenard, Mr. and Mrs. John Lloyd, Dr. and Mrs. Gilbert N. Ling, M.D., Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Linsk, M.D., Dr. Jack Lubin, M.D., Mr. Samuel C. Maitin, Dr. and Mrs. John McCahab, M.D., Dr. Wallace T. McCaffrey, Mr. and Mrs. Mason McGinniss, Mrs. Margaret Y. Newbold, Dr. and Mrs. James Neville, M.D., Dr. Robert J. Osborn, Mr. and Mrs. Christopher Nicolson, Mr. and Mrs. Francis T. Nicolson, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Paulnier, Dr. and Mrs. Price Peterson, M.D., Mr. and Mrs. Robert Reifsnnyder, Mrs. Kenneth Scott, Dr. Walter Selove, M.D., Dr. and Mrs. Arthur Shostak, Dr. Gerhard Speigler, Dr. and Mrs. Herbert Spiro, Miss Helen H. Striedieck, Mrs. Kathryn W. Trotta, Mr. and Mrs. John Van Sickle, Dr. and Mrs. John Withall, Mrs. C. Fenno Hoffman, Dr. and Mrs. Philip Jacob, Dr. Daniel S. Cheever, Dr. and Mrs. E. Wayne Marshall Jr., M.D., Mr. and Mrs. Conrad Hamerman, Dr. and Mrs. Henry J. Abraham, Dr. and Mrs. Herbert S. Levine, Mr. and Mrs. Richard K. Taylor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me ask the Senator a direct question: Assuming that the Senator had the choice of supporting two dictatorships, one which was a pro-Communist dictatorship and one which was an anti-Communist one, which one would he choose?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Louisiana always puts out a grade school question which assumes that an answer is either white or black. Of course, anyone would take the choice which is so obviously given in the Senator's loaded question. That is not the point. It would take several hours to make the point, and I do not want to argue with the Senator, whose choice is primitive.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator answered the question—I am not sure he answered the question, but if he

answered the question—I am assuming, he has, under the circumstances stated, said that he would choose the anti-Communist dictator as against the pro-Communist dictator, which puts him in the situation of being a little primitive.

Mr. CLARK. Since the Senator is so excited, I think we should terminate the discussion.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY HONORING SENATOR DOUGLAS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by our present Vice President, the former Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, given at a dinner honoring our colleague, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, on January 14, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT DINNER HONORING SENATOR PAUL DOUGLAS, JANUARY 14, 1966

The central purpose of our gathering tonight is to press, beg, persuade, wheedle, cajole, and to draft PAUL DOUGLAS to run again for the U.S. Senate.

PAUL DOUGLAS is a giant of a man and a giant of a Senator. From whatever aspect you look at him, he towers over the political scene.

I speak of him first as a distinguished scholar, because that is how he began.

At Bowdoin College he won a Phi Beta Kappa key, despite working his way through college and playing center on the football team. He is a Ph. D. from Columbia University, and the holder of many honorary degrees.

He is the author of many books and articles on economics, and his colleagues have honored him by election to the presidency of the American Economic Association.

I speak next of PAUL DOUGLAS as a politician of principle, and a very practical and effective politician too. You in Chicago know his record in this city and State.

In the late 1920's, he investigated and exposed the Insull utility empire. He worked hard and successfully in this State for utilities regulation, old-age pensions, public housing, and unemployment insurance.

You know of his election in 1939 as an alderman for the fifth ward, and of the role of leadership he immediately assumed in the city's affairs. You know of his election as Senator in 1948, and his reelection in 1954 and 1960.

Coming from outside Chicago, however, I want to tell you that, as a loyal and hard-working member of the Democratic Party, PAUL DOUGLAS has spoken and worked for our candidates throughout the Nation.

I speak of PAUL DOUGLAS next as the legislator, with a record of solid achievement in the Congress second to none.

It was his bill which raised the minimum wage to a dollar an hour.

It was his bill which provided for the disclosure of union and management pension and welfare funds.

It was he who wrote the original Area Redevelopment Act, to bring industry and jobs to the depressed areas of this country. His name is on the new Economic Development Act, which updates and expands this program.

In the mid-1950's PAUL DOUGLAS, along with a small group of others (including a young Senator from Minnesota) proposed sweeping civil rights legislation to secure our Negro fellow-citizens the full protection of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Con-

stitution. In 1964, these proposals became the law of the land.

In 1960 PAUL DOUGLAS and a small group of others (again including a Senator from Minnesota) proposed that Federal registrars be sent into areas of the country where Negroes were effectively denied the right to vote. In 1965, these Douglas-Humphrey proposals became the law of the land.

In 1958, PAUL DOUGLAS proposed a general tax cut in order to bolster the economy, cut unemployment, and stimulate economic growth. His proposal was rejected by the Eisenhower administration—but under President Kennedy and President Johnson it became policy. And it has been eminently successful, too. Thanks largely to timely tax cuts, we have enjoyed the longest sustained economic growth in our history.

Back in the days when they had almost no chance of enactment, PAUL DOUGLAS was a sponsor or cosponsor of medicare, Federal aid to elementary education, aid to higher education, the immigration bill, the clean air bill, and the water pollution bill—to name only a few. Last year these became law—and he either drafted, sponsored or cosponsored almost every one of them.

There is no Member of the Senate today who has his name stamped on more major issues, major bills, and major legislation than PAUL DOUGLAS.

Just as important is the role he has played in defending the interests of the American people against harmful legislative proposals. When certain forces, which shall remain nameless, tried to upset the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision, it was PAUL DOUGLAS who led the fight to uphold and defend it.

He won that battle in 1964 and again in 1965—and, if need be, it will be won again in 1966.

He has killed more bad bills—bills to help special interests or secure a subsidy for the powerful—than any man in the Senate of the United States.

I speak now of PAUL DOUGLAS the man—of his loyalty to his friends, of his courage, of his straightforwardness, of his scrupulous integrity. This man disdains all fraud and pretense. He stands not only for truth in lending and truth in packaging, but for truth in people and above all truth to himself.

He is a man of conscience—a man who does right, and by his example makes it easier for others to do right. And let me add, he is no narrow, self-centered pedant. He is a devoted and enthusiastic connoisseur of literature and the arts.

He is not only great in mind and heart, but great in physical stamina as well. When I led the fight for the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the crucial test was our ability to answer the quorum calls which were made every 2 or 3 hours of the day, 5 days a week. These were strenuous times. And it was PAUL DOUGLAS who made the best record of any Senator in answering those quorum calls and thus breaking the filibuster. He answered 96 percent of the 280 quorum calls in the 1964 session of Congress—while, at the same time, he was making 8 or 10 speeches here in Illinois on weekends.

And when I think PAUL DOUGLAS, the human being, I am bound to think of his good wife Emily as well—a person of distinction in her own right, charming, intelligent, and gifted with a talent for getting things done.

Here is a real bargain—like the 2 for 1 sales we put on from time to time in our family drugstore. You elect one and you get two.

Finally, I speak of PAUL DOUGLAS the patriot—the man who, at the age of 50, enlisted as a private in the Marines. I recall that, while serving with the 1st Marine Division in the Pacific, he advanced through the ranks to lieutenant colonel, was twice wounded, and spent 14 months in hospitals.

to the Senator from Louisiana on the conditions previously requested and granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the war we are fighting in Vietnam is not an isolated event. It is an integral part of the struggle we have been waging for a very long time in many places in the world. We are not fighting merely to protect the people of South Vietnam from the overt and savage aggression of the Government at Hanoi. We are engaged in the continuing struggle to resist those who seek to establish the principle that might makes right; we seek to demonstrate our good faith to all those peoples of the free world with whom we have joined in commitments to resist aggression by those whose avowed aim is to dominate their neighbors by force of arms.

We are continuing to do in Vietnam essentially what we did in World War II when we joined in preventing the enslavement of the free world by the forces of power-mad dictators whose intentions to end democratic freedoms were made no less clear than the Communist rulers in Peiping make theirs today. Despite our fervent desire to see the end of violence in international affairs and the periodic success of the United Nations Organization in settling disputes by discussion, we soon found that aggression by force of arms could only be met by similar force. We were obliged to come to the assistance of the people of Iran, of Greece, of Turkey, of West Berlin, of South Korea, and of Formosa. We were convinced in each of these instances that our freedom ultimately depended upon the defeat of the aggression being carried out, or overtly threatened, and we were successful in turning away these threats.

We must have no less determination to help the people of South Vietnam defend themselves than we have demonstrated in defending the people of other lands in their struggles against aggressors. Our success there is no less important than it was in West Berlin and South Korea. As President Johnson has said so well:

We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else.

Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace, because we learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another country, bringing with it perhaps even larger and crueler conflict, as we have learned from the lessons of history.

Although the prospect is not a happy one, Mr. President, it will do no good to try to delude ourselves. This Nation has faced difficult and dangerous situations many times in our history, and we shall face many more. So long as the Communist aggressors seek to dominate by force of arms other people who struggle to save their freedom, we must remain ready to face aggression if need be. To do otherwise would be folly, and contrary to the lessons of our past.

It will be a little less grim if we see the task in Vietnam in its true perspective—as another cruel, but necessary event in the long march of mankind toward a period when we can live in peace with all men. It has always been our heritage that we will fight to defend freedom. It is a high principle and one which carries a heavy price tag, but I for one do not intend to propose that we change it.

If these views make those who disagree describe me as a hawk instead of a dove; I shall not quarrel with the term. I believe that there is much hard fighting ahead before the dove of peace can find place to roost in Saigon, and it is the hawks, not the doves, who will have to do the fighting if freedom is to exist anywhere in southeast Asia.

Some of those who oppose our actions in coming to the defense of South Vietnam say that our action is illegal and that we have no right to have our forces engaged in battle there. Those who make this charge do so without proper knowledge of the authority which the President has under article II, section 2, of the Constitution, and they disregard the specific actions of the Congress in supporting the policy the President has been following in Vietnam.

In our history there have been at least 125 instances in which the President, without congressional authorization and in the absence of a declaration of war, has ordered the Armed Forces to take actions or to maintain positions abroad. This issue has been submitted for the judgment of the Congress and congressional support was expressed almost unanimously in the joint resolution of August 10, 1964. This resolution included the authorization to use our Armed Forces in southeast Asia.

Recently, more than 25 outstanding professors of law at universities throughout the country gave their emphatic support to the legality of the President's actions. These professors included eminent professors such as Professors Sohn and Baxter at Harvard University, Professor McDougall at Yale, Professor Bishop at the University of Michigan, and Professor Franklin at the University of Southern California. Specifically these professors endorsed the following statement:

As teachers of international law we wish to affirm that the presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam at the request of the government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of U.S. forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression. We believe that the evidence indicates that the United States and South Vietnam are taking action that attacks neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the People's Republic—action that seeks only to terminate aggression originating in North Vietnam.

I have heard it suggested that a law school student who expressed such an opinion should be dismissed from the university. If that should be done practically all of the international lawyers in this country would have to be put out of business.

Others have urged that we wash our

hands of this affair by dumping it into the lap of the United Nations. This proposal is clearly designed to abdicate our responsibilities, not only in Vietnam but in all of Asia. I cannot agree with this thinking.

We have placed ourselves on record before the world that we are dedicated to insure the freedom of the people of South Vietnam. We must keep those commitments as a matter of our own national responsibility.

We know that the President and Ambassador Goldberg have, of course, been using fully those facilities of the United Nations which can be useful under these circumstances. The facilities of private diplomacy are one of the principal assets of the United Nations and they will continue to be used fully.

Senators should remember that, when we requested the assistance of the United Nations in connection with the Tonkin Gulf affair last year, the only result was that Hanoi and Peiping denied the competence of the United Nations to deal with the matter.

A Senator recently charged that we are completely imposing our will upon the defenseless people of South Vietnam, who do not really wish our assistance. To those who make this charge, I urge that they read the remarkably able address of Prime Minister Ky on January 15 of this year. In what can be called an address on the state of the nation, Premier Ky honestly and forthrightly admits the difficulties and the shortcomings of his government.

He is no less forthright in stating the hopes and aspirations of the people:

First of all, what do we really want?

Such a question posed to any Vietnamese concerned with the fate of his compatriots and the honor of the nation and the happiness of the people in this part of the world—which means the happiness of each individual and each family—gets this unique and unvarying answer:

Decidedly, not communism.

To such an answer, no additional comment is needed.

That is exactly the answer that I give to those who, as did the Senator from Pennsylvania, recently suggested that there was something amiss with the South Vietnam Government.

It is not everything we would like it to be; neither is ours; and neither is that of many of our allies. But we do not want communism. We would much rather have what we have than what they have; and we are willing to fight and die to keep it that way.

It is fair enough to ask any of those who seek to criticize friends of ours around the world, friendly and allied governments which stand side by side with us in this case in our freedom, liberty, and independence in seeking to defend their own. Do they know any government they would prefer to have replaced by Communist government?

In my opinion, if any Senator wants to make that statement I do not believe the people will send him back to the Senate. I do not believe that is their opinion.

I continue to quote from Prime Minister Ky:

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1235

I recall the Bronze Star he was awarded for "heroic achievement in action."

The American Political Science Association, a professional organization with no partisan ax to grind, honored him with their Distinguished Service Award. They said that PAUL DOUGLAS " * * * has prophetically raised the eternal problems of human freedom and dignity in terms of our contemporary democratic society" and is a man " * * * rigorous intellect, a responsible independent defender of human rights, and a consistent advocate of social progress."

Here is the Senator of whom one of America's most distinguished living historians, Allen Nevins, wrote:

"Of all our Senators, none has written a more consistently elevated record of public service; none has so clearly combined intellectual distinction—technical expertness—with practical legislative power; none has set so high a moral example."

This is the man—PAUL DOUGLAS—whom your State and our Nation need in the Senate of the United States.

RENT SUBSIDIES

Mr. CLARK. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an interesting article under the byline of Mr. Stanley Penn, from the Wall Street Journal of January 24, 1966, dealing with an experimental rent subsidy program, which shows how well the rent subsidy program can work. I hope that, when the appropriate time comes later, we shall be able to reinstitute the rent subsidy program. Members will recall that this program was adopted by Congress last year but was then killed in the appropriations committees. I hope we shall be able to get an appropriation for this needed and desirable program, which has been supported by the President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDIZED TENANTS—SOME POOR FOLK RESIDE IN MIDDLE-CLASS HOMES WITH HELP OF U.S. FUNDS—THEY GROW MORE RESPONSIBLE IN IMPROVED ENVIRONMENT; JOHNSON SEEKS WIDER PLAN—A CONTRAST TO PUBLIC HOUSING

(By Stanley Penn)

BOSTON.—A middle-aged Negro woman who lives in a comfortable four-bedroom apartment on this city's southwest side has a secret she closely guards from her neighbors—Uncle Sam pays \$54 of her \$127 monthly rent.

The woman, her husband and their seven children are part of a federally financed experiment to determine whether poor families can become more productive members of society if they are immersed in a middle-class environment.

Early returns indicate they can.

The Boston Housing Authority, which administers the experiment here, reports tenants receiving Federal rent subsidies—there are 40 such families in the 450-family experiment—clearly demonstrate more "social responsibility" than poor families living in public housing projects. Rent payments have been made promptly, the privately owned apartments have been kept in relatively good order and there have been no brushes with the law. This, of course, is often not the case in public housing.

FUEL FOR THE ADMINISTRATION

The apparent success of the Boston experiment is adding impetus to the Johnson administration's campaign to put such rent

subsidy arrangements on a nationwide basis this year. The administration tried to push a broad-scale rent plan through Congress in 1965, but the lawmakers refused to vote the funds required, charging the eligibility rules were so loosely drawn up that persons far from poor could get subsidies.

Now, the administration has tightened up the requirements and passage by the re-convened Congress seems probable—unless greatly increased military needs should cause major cutbacks on the Great Society front.

President Johnson originally asked for \$80 million for rent subsidies in the fiscal year ending June 30, and requested that the yearly payments be increased over a 4-year span to an annual rate of \$150 million. Such a sum, it is estimated, would provide partial rent for about 375,000 low-income families. Under the plan, low-income tenants would pay a quarter of their wages for rent and the Federal subsidy would cover the rest. The President is expected to renew his plea for rent subsidy funds in today's budget message.

What families would qualify for the program would depend in part on the area of the country. A low income would be \$3,500 or less in one region but \$4,500 or more in another. The families would also have to be residing in housing judged by officials to be substandard, or be elderly persons, or physically handicapped or displaced by urban renewal or highway projects.

TOUGHER ELIGIBILITY

To tighten up on eligibility, the plan would require that a family could not have assets exceeding \$2,000; under the previous proposal which Congress rejected, assets were allowed to total up to twice a family's annual income. Also, an elderly couple's assets now would be limited to \$5,000, while before the maximum was set at three times an elderly family's income.

The Negro mother of seven in the apartment here is perhaps typical of the sort of person the administration hopes to help. Her husband works as a laborer, making only about \$4,000 a year. Without the subsidy, the family clearly would not be able to afford the apartment.

"The children here are nicer and better behaved, and there's more room for my kids to play," she says. She admits that "keeping all these white walls clean is some job—in public housing the walls are darker and easier to keep looking clean." Also, she says, "I always got the 'super' (building superintendent) checking on me to see if things are all right." Still, she adds, "I manage to get the work done—I'd hate to give this big apartment up."

If this family's income increases, the rent subsidy will be reduced proportionately: if its income level eventually exceeds a specified ceiling, the family could continue living in the apartment but wouldn't get any subsidy. This continued-occupancy provision is a prime difference between the rent-subsidy plan and public housing, which requires a family to move out after its income reaches a stipulated level.

A NOTE OF CAUTION

While the Boston experiment is an apparent success, its administrators caution that participants in the plan here have been selected with somewhat more care than would probably be taken in any nationwide project.

"We looked for families with some sense of responsibility in conducting their affairs," says Jack Mahoney, an attorney for Development Corp. of America which manages two of the three garden-type apartment complexes in which subsidized tenants here live.

For such reasons as this, some critics of the nationwide rent-subsidy plan warn that it could well run into considerable problems.

"When you start bringing in thousands of low-income families, some of them from

broken homes, others on welfare, you're going to have operating problems" not now evident in the Boston experiment, argues one real estate official familiar with the administration's plan. "You'll have to teach them how to use facilities properly. You may have to provide special police protection" for other tenants.

There are at least two other experimental rent-subsidy programs currently underway, and, like the program here, they indicate a nationwide plan probably would prove successful—though not without overcoming significant problems.

New York State already has selected more than 40 low-income families for rent subsidies, to be paid by the State, and enough State money has been authorized to accommodate 600 families eventually. In Washington, D.C., 50 low-income families are living in single-family houses leased with the aid of Federal funds from private landlords.

However, as in Boston, the low-income tenants in New York and Washington are being picked with greater care than might be exercised under a nationwide program.

"We are not taking any obvious problem families, nor are we taking any welfare families," says a New York State housing official. Because of the State's stringent eligibility standards, adds a private housing official who helps manage the New York program, "we've been having a tough time finding enough poor tenants to fill up the apartments that we've allotted. Many of the applicants are welfare cases. Others have a poor standard of living or a bad marital history or don't work regularly."

An official connected with the Washington experiment concedes, "We only wanted those who showed a real interest in moving in and were willing to mow lawns, remove snow, and other chores" they would not normally be faced with in public housing.

How could the problems posed by a less selective nationwide program best be tackled?

If the rent-subsidy experiments now under way are any indication, social workers would play a key role, Boston's Mr. Mahoney recalls. "A few of the low-income tenants weren't meeting their responsibilities in keeping their apartments clean. We got social workers to help us. For once or twice a week for 6 weeks, we had inspections. After that, there was considerable improvement."

The Washington project, using \$13,000 contributed by charitable groups, hired a social worker to help its poor families. The social worker, Miss Mary Gruenheck, says, "Some of the families had never lived in houses before, just apartments, and they were overwhelmed with all the space. We had to show them how to use it properly."

Miss Gruenheck put some of the families in touch with the Salvation Army, where they acquired furniture, and on occasion she has lent some of them money to buy small items. She also has referred a few individuals to a nearby psychiatrist and recently helped a youngster over an emotional crisis, when his mother died and his father remarried.

An ancillary aim of the administration's rent-subsidy plan is to promote racial integration; some of its loudest congressional opponents, in fact, are from the Deep South. Some skeptics contend, however, that in actual practice housing containing subsidized families rapidly would become all-Negro.

One private real estate official estimates that "Negro tenants in any development must be kept at no more than 30 to 35 percent of the total if whites are not to leave in large numbers." He contends any substantial influx of subsidized families, largely Negro, into existing middle-income housing will drive out a lot of whites and lead eventually to all-Negro apartment buildings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1237

There is no answer more eloquent than the blood of thousands of combatants who have sacrificed themselves for the survival of the fatherland from the Red imperialists' invasion.

There is no reason stronger than the hardship endured by the Vietnamese combatants and civilians during the lifetime of one generation, the hardships of those who are determined to eradicate Communist ideology from this part of the world.

There is no evidence more concrete than the flow of anti-Red refugees who prefer leaving behind all that is so dear to them; homes, rice fields, villages, rather than live shamefully under Communists' tyranny.

We are determined not to be Communist. Such is the unanimous determination, the slogan of the whole Vietnamese population, yesterday, today and tomorrow, and until the day the Communist threat is eliminated from this country.

But how do we get rid of this threat?

There is no other alternative to the solution than to defeat the Communists and to route them from their strongholds. We must defeat the Communists and exterminate communism. Otherwise, the Communists will exterminate us and enslave our people from our generation to our offspring's generation. No one can foresee when enslavement by Communists will end.

On this occasion, I deem it my duty to point out the traditional ideal and determination of the Vietnamese people which is to always cherish and seek peace but only a peace which will guarantee its freedom, independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Any other form of peace which fails to provide these guarantees, would only be a lure into slavery and one which the Vietnamese people, with their clear-sightedness and courage, would crush down in order to proceed towards a genuine and realistic peace.

For those who still nurture doubts about this issue, I would say to them: "Our concept of peace is very simple. We have not provoked war, we have not declared war. The present war is an invasion from outside our country and one which at the outset was disguised as an internal struggle. But the disguise has been removed for a long time and the invader has uncovered himself. Now it is up to the invader from outside and his subversive henchmen within our country to end the invasion and subversion. Then peace would at once return to this part of the country. Thus, we would end the concern of so many nations, large and small, and of so many statesmen the world over. If the invaders, acting like a blind force, cannot restrain themselves, then it would be our duty and the duty of all those peace-loving people to combine efforts to contain their ambition. Otherwise, the last resort would be to 'outlaw them as peace saboteurs' in this peace-loving and freedom-loving part of this country."

I deem it my duty also to express the sincere gratitude of all our people to all the countries and international organizations and statesmen, as well as to all religious leaders, especially Pope Paul VI, who have demonstrated great concern over the plight of the Vietnamese people. I further want to insist that peace is workable only if it can guarantee national independence as well as the people's freedom of thought and human dignity.

I also want to associate all my fellow citizens and comrades in arms to the acknowledgement that, under whatever circumstances, we should ourselves be responsible for our own destiny. No other nation is qualified and able to decide on our destiny, independently of our own will. For reasons of international solidarity, we have accepted and are grateful for the moral and material, military and economic assistance from the

friendly countries. But never can we tolerate any interference harmful to our national sovereignty or any decision at variance without people's aspirations.

It certainly cannot be said that the people of South Vietnam have achieved political maturity and that they are untroubled by internal divisions. Nevertheless, the words of Premier Ky ring clear in terms of the efforts they are making to avoid being enslaved by the Communist forces from the north.

When we consider the problems with which his government has had to deal in the past 7 months, we should applaud and not condemn his efforts and accomplishments thus far. When he came to power, there were few indeed who ventured to predict that he would still be in power, or even in Saigon, at the beginning of another year.

Communist domination of South Vietnam would mean the destruction of those who are fighting there now for their freedom. The enemy who has killed or kidnapped almost 50,000 civilians during the past 5 years would certainly be merciless in dealing with those who might fall into his hands in the future. Dire indeed would be the fate of the more than 1½ million members of the Catholic faith who are now in South Vietnam.

When we record the toll of civilians who have fallen to the Vietcong, Mr. President, we should remember that they had only to promise their cooperation to avoid their fate. Yet they chose death, or, in many cases, a fate far worse than mere death, rather than yield to the enemy. A very large proportion of those killed or kidnapped were the local officials in key governmental posts or teachers working in the rural areas who stayed at their posts, knowing the dangers they were facing. When it is said that we are fighting a nationalistic war for our own purposes in southeast Asia, Mr. President, we dishonor the thousands of those brave South Vietnamese who have already sacrificed themselves.

The losses we are suffering among our own forces are heavy, and they are mounting constantly, but they are still small compared to the price paid by the South Vietnamese forces. From 1960 through 1965, the military forces of South Vietnam lost 35,186 men killed in action. During the same period, the total number of soldiers wounded in action, captured or missing, reached 126,103—and South Vietnam is a small country. We do not fight alone in South Vietnam, Mr. President, we fight with a people dedicated to defend their freedom who are still bearing the brunt of the battle, but against an invader who is bringing massive, and ever-increasing, forces across the border from the north.

It was also said that, regardless of our actions, the Asiatics will eliminate the white man from the entire area and that we should abjectly surrender now rather than delay the debacle. Those who propose this course are urging the abandonment of all our allies in Asia, and opening the doors to the rest of the free world. I emphatically disagree with this concept, but it is certainly true that we must take the long view in considering our obligations to our friends and allies in Asia.

We do not underestimate the dedication of the Chinese Communists to the task which they have set for themselves. It is no less than the elimination of freedom—first from the territories on their present borders, and then from the territories adjacent to these expanded borders, and on beyond these horizons.

We have already seen their efforts to leapfrog into Africa and Latin America. Their efforts to infiltrate these areas are continuing, but they have not been succeeding, and they will not succeed. One of the main reasons they are not succeeding and will not succeed is because we are standing firm in South Vietnam and intend to continue to stand firm there.

For myself, I urge the President to make even greater efforts to carry the battle to the enemy in every way that we can. If more troops are needed, if more ports and more supplies are needed, if greater assistance to the people of South Vietnam is required, we must provide all this and more. If this means that the President concludes that we must impose higher taxes in this country, and if this means we have to impose limitations upon our own economy in other ways, than I stand ready, as chairman, to urge these measures upon the members of the Finance Committee and upon the Members of the Senate.

I have not been before, and I am not now, an advocate of insufficient measures to gain an objective. History is altogether too full of instances of "too little, too late." I earnestly hope that this will not be the result of our efforts in southeast Asia.

I am frank to admit, Mr. President, that I have not always understood and accepted the importance of our willingness to support those who would fight for their freedom. I doubted the wisdom of the decision to assist Chiang Kai-shek in defending Quemoy and Matsu. Thus far, those islands have been held successfully and without great difficulty.

It cannot be said for certain, but I have also come to believe that greater support for Chiang on the mainland of China might have led to a vastly different situation in the whole of Asia. I have not forgotten that some of those who would have us abandon South Vietnam now said then that those we have come to know as vicious enemies of democratic freedoms everywhere were "agrarian reformers" who should be abetted in their conquest of China.

Various people in important governmental positions from time to time have sought to promote the idea that it would be necessary to yield Formosa to the Communists. They have been proved wrong. When we relate the struggle here in Vietnam to the larger struggle, it is clear to me that we must seek to deny Communist aggression every area where the people are willing to fight in defense of their own freedom.

To permit any of these areas to fall to ruthless aggressions would be merely to whet the appetite of the aggressors, and set the stage for a larger and more fateful showdown somewhere else. When one looks at what Americans have been able to do in our history when con-

fronted with far greater odds than those we now face in Vietnam, every American should be able to muster the fortitude to help this Nation fulfill its obligations there.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to observe for the RECORD that I have yielded rather generously to my colleagues from the time I had expected to use in the remarks that I shall now make.

I was glad to do so. I believe that there are far more important issues for the Senate to give its attention to, issues to which it owes its serious attention and which should take precedence over the matter which is the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. President, this issue was before the Senate in the closing days of the previous session. I spoke at some length at that time in opposition to the measure, as I shall do again today. My remarks at that time were made on the 7th day of October and will be found beginning on page 25291 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. Those who may be interested in all of the reasons I have for the position I am taking can read my remarks made at that time in conjunction with those that I shall now make and have an overall picture of the many potent reasons I have for my opposition to the pending measure.

The legislation now pending before the Congress to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, poses a grave issue that is of vital concern to every American citizen who values our heritage of freedom. Inextricably involved in this issue are basic and fundamental principles that are of the very essence of liberty. They constitute one of the most precious of our God-given and inalienable rights—the right to work and to earn a livelihood. They are among those rights which the Founding Fathers so cherished that they wisely enshrined them in our Federal Constitution as a “Bill of Rights” for all Americans.

Mr. President, we are witnessing a strange paradox in the U.S. Senate today. Some 200,000 American boys are fighting and risking their lives on foreign soil today in order that a government on the other side of the world and people in a strange land might retain their freedom and have a chance to establish a government which will conform to their wishes.

We are expending the blood of American youth in an attempt to secure that

right to another government and another people while we are witnessing a battle waged in the Senate today by those who are attempting to destroy and take away from 40 million American workers their freedom of choice as to whether they will or will not join a union.

Mr. President, there are some 55 million industrial workers, or nonagricultural workers, in the United States who are eligible ostensibly to join a union. Seventeen million of those 55 million have chosen to do so. So far, 30 percent of them have chosen to do so, and the remaining 70 percent have elected not to do so.

Many areas of the country and many States have right-to-work laws. They have a freedom of choice and have exercised that choice and not joined unions.

We are now waging a war against those who have not joined. And this is a form of war. A battle is now being waged on the floor of the U.S. Senate in an endeavor to compel some 40 million non-agricultural workers of this country to join a union in order to have the privilege and opportunity to work, to earn wages, and to earn a livelihood for themselves and for their families.

It is wrong. Congress would do well to give its attention to matters of urgency, to those matters which should take precedence and have priority over every other proposed piece of legislation or program that is essential. Certainly any essential matter should have precedence over matters which are dispensable. The legislation pending today is expendable and dispensable. It should never be here in time of war. It should not be here at any time because it is unjust. It is oppressive. It seeks to force American workers to pay tribute for a privilege that is their God-given right.

The repeal of section 14(b) would inevitably lead to a further erosion of the rights and liberties of millions of our citizens.

Section 14(b) does only one thing. It reserves to the people in each State of this Nation—not only my State, not only the 19 States which have right-to-work laws—the power to enact laws prohibiting both employers and labor unions from making compulsory unionism a condition of employment. That section does not in any way prohibit voluntary unionism. Nor does it permit the States to impose any restrictions upon the federally guaranteed right of employees to voluntarily join labor unions, to contribute financial and other support to them, and to bargain through them with employers in regard to wages, hours, and other conditions of employment.

No State is authorized to enact laws which would relieve employers of their federally imposed obligations to bargain with labor unions selected by their employees for such purposes, or which would prohibit such unions from achieving 100-percent membership among such employees through persuasion and a voluntary choice on the part of the employees.

I assert, Mr. President, without fear of successful contradiction and without fear that anyone will attempt any contradiction of this remark, that there is not a workingman in this Nation today

who cannot voluntarily join a union if he wishes to do so. The choice is his. He can join before sundown, if he so desires.

In most instances, he has an opportunity to choose between unions, as to which union he will join. The unions have a right to present their case, to solicit membership, to argue their cause, to point out to the worker where it is to his advantage to join, to persuade him, to convince him. So far, they have failed to convince about 40 million American workers. Failing, Mr. President, in their efforts at solicitation and persuasion, the unions now seek the compulsory power of the law to say they must join or not work.

That is not Americanism. It is contrary to every concept of liberty that our Founding Fathers conceived at the time of the Declaration of Independence—the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They did not say, “provided you join a union,” or “provided you join a church” or “provided you join the chamber of commerce.”

They said, “the inalienable right to life.” Mr. President, how can one have life without food? How can the workman have food without wages? How can he have wages without employment?

What we propose to do here by compulsion is to make the American workers pay tribute for the privilege of earning bread for their families.

In brief, section 14(b) only permits State legislation which is limited to protecting workers by prohibiting compulsory unionism from being imposed upon them.

All the Federal Government has done is say that the States, if they will, if they wish to, may prohibit the imposition of compulsory unionism. My State did that. Nineteen other States of the Union have done that. I do not wish to take that right away from the States.

In the context of freedom and liberty, compulsion is an ugly word and compulsory association is the very antithesis of freedom. Thus, it is little wonder that proponents of repeal of section 14(b) attempt to substitute the term “union security” for compulsory unionism.

Where in our Constitution is there any basis for requiring compulsory membership in any organization? Churches are on a voluntary basis. Chambers of commerce are on a voluntary basis. Business associations are on a voluntary basis. Such organizations do not necessarily involve something as vital as the right to earn a living; but here we are attempting to place that right, not on a voluntary basis, but under a compulsory requirement, at the discretion and will of labor leaders.

But whatever substitute term they use, union security or any other such term, it cannot conceal the truth—the fact that it is compulsory unionism and nothing else but compulsory unionism that union leaders seek through the repeal of section 14(b).

STATE RIGHT-TO-WORK-LAWS

So long as section 14(b) remains the law of the land the States retain the power to enact legislation prohibiting

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1247

approach is used concerning the question of joining a church. I have never known a preacher of any denomination to say to those who come to the doors of a church to worship that they first must join and pay an assessment in order to participate in the worship service and the other activities of the church. Regardless of denomination, if a church is meeting its obligations to the community and is offering services which are needed and desired, then it does not have to worry about who joins and who pays because the active members will be there not only to carry the load, but they will also be there to expand the cause.

In all sincerity, I look upon the mission of organized labor in the same way.

I have a very deep conviction that if the Federal Government attempts to contrive and fashion a system under which any man is forced to join any organization to earn a living then a real disservice and destruction of the workingman's place in our society will surely result.

As all of us know, a great deal of discussion has taken place in recent years about the question of individual rights of our citizens. I think that more so than on any other public question, there is almost unanimity on the basic question involved in the issue of right-to-work laws.

In almost all cases after all questions are weighed, the one point which emerges and stands out above all others is the simple one of the basic right of the individual to exercise his freedom of choice.

In this connection, I was very much impressed with the editorial which appeared in the Charlotte Observer of January 25, 1966. The editorial pointed out that once again efforts were being made to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The editorial gave passing consideration to the political commitments involved and went on simply to state the heart of the issue once again, and I think the point the editorial made is worth repeating at this time. That point is as follows:

The basic issue is a man's right to join or to refuse to join a union. That right should remain unimpaired. The union that must earn the allegiance of workers by its performance will be more responsible, more honest, more concerned about the rights of individuals and corporations, more considerate of the public interest.

In this fashion, the Charlotte Observer editorial wraps up the whole matter in a nice, neat package, and we can make any arguments we choose, but we must come back and make our own decision on this one central, overriding point. We cannot escape it.

I do not believe a successful argument can be made that any individual should be deprived of his right to work at a job available to him and for which he is qualified. Nor do I believe—and I am certain there is complete agreement among many here today—that any person or organization be permitted to coerce, to harm, or injure the individual or his family, or his property at home, at work or elsewhere, in any manner or action relating to his employment.

This is a declaration of belief, a most widely held one, I hope, in the basic and

deeply rooted rights guaranteed our citizens under the 5th, 9th, and 14th amendments of the Constitution of the United States which implicitly protect the right to work since they prohibit the deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and forbid abridgment of the privileges and immunities of our citizens. As so aptly stated by Justice Hughes, in *Truax v. Raich*, 239 U.S. 33 (1915):

It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is of the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the 14th amendment to secure.

It is my contention that right-to-work laws provide protection so that the inherent right of an individual to secure and hold a job shall not be abridged by a union security agreement entered into by the employer and the union. More properly stated, voluntary unionism embraces a concept of human liberty quite as fundamental as freedom of speech, religion or assembly.

By the enactment of section 14(b), the Congress of the United States recognized and preserved to the citizens of the several States the right, if they so chose, to enact statutes or constitutional amendments protecting the freedom of choice of their individual citizens so that their very jobs and livelihood could not be placed in jeopardy through compulsion by an agreement entered into by an aggressive union and an acquiescent employer. The principle of voluntary unionism should not be open to compromise. Either one must believe in the freedom of individual choice or must accede to the view that it is proper to shackle the will of the unwilling employee through compulsive union devices.

Consider what some of our greatest liberal thinkers have had to say about the importance of human freedom which is involved in the cause of voluntary unionism. They certainly cannot be accused of being hostile to the labor movement. Samuel Gompers, one of the giants of American labor, saw, in his time, the issue much more clearly than some of his modern successors see it today. Gompers stated:

I want to urge devotion to the fundamentals of human liberty, the principles of voluntarism. No lasting gain has ever come from compulsion. If we seek to force, we but tear apart that which, united, is invincible.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in the State right-to-work cases, quoted extensively from the late Justice Brandeis, who held that—

The ideal condition for a union is to be strong and stable, and yet to have in the trade outside its own ranks an appreciable number of men who are nonunionists. Such a nucleus of unorganized labor will check oppression by the unions as the unions check oppression by the employer.

In 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a universal Declaration of Human Rights:

ARTICLE XX

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

RESUMPTION OF BOMBING IN VIETNAM

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing his right to the floor, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina may yield to me for the purpose of making remarks on another subject.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, with that understanding, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, both on and off the floor of the Senate in recent days, there has been a discussion which, if it cannot properly be described as a debate, is nonetheless a significant discussion with reference to our involvement in Vietnam. For the most part, the discussions have centered around the question of whether the bombing of North Vietnam should be resumed.

This is a proper point for the beginning of a much deeper and much more extensive discussion not only of Vietnam, but also of the whole function of America in history during this second half of the 20th century.

Our commitment in Vietnam is different from our commitment in the Korean war. It is also different from our commitment in World War II, when our objectives were clearly definable. On the basis of that kind of understanding and comprehension and intellectual judgment, we were able to make a quite full moral commitment to the achievement of those objectives.

The Vietnamese situation is quite different. It calls for a national debate, a national discussion, and a real searching of the mind and soul of America. It includes everyone who is concerned about the future of this country and its role. It concerns the people responsible for political action. It involves those responsible for making an intellectual judgment on the extent of our moral commitments.

I am encouraged by the growing response to this challenge throughout America today. We need to be on guard against being caught and committed to certain figures of speech, to a kind of ideological commitment which prevents us from making a fair and continuous and objective judgment. If we find ourselves in the position of trying to prove or disprove a metaphor, our position is little different from that of the historical determinists with reference to communism and any other ideology.

The particular point with reference to bombing North Vietnam comes to this: When the decision was made to begin the bombings, the argument was that it would accomplish two purposes—first, a military purpose, but, more important, a political or a diplomatic achievement.

Bombings have been stopped. The question now is whether they should be resumed. It is my position that the burden of proof is on two branches of the administration. The burden is on the Defense Department to prove, if it can, that the bombings in the past have had any significant military effect. The burden is also upon the State Department to prove that the bombings have had some kind of beneficial political or

diplomatic effect. If the bombings have not had these benefits in the past, then at least it should be demonstrated to us that the resumption of such bombings would have a desirable military or political effect, or both.

It is my judgment that this has not been demonstrated with reference to the bombings in the past; and I have not yet been convinced that the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam would advance the military objectives, or that they would advance our political objectives.

The serious problem today is that we are called upon to make a kind of moral commitment to an objective or to a set of purposes which we do not clearly understand. There is a kind of imbalance between the understanding and the comprehension of the objective on the one hand and, on the other, the moral commitment which we are called upon to make.

I do not believe that a balance between those two can be restored only by Senate debate. This problem requires the attention of mind and spirit, the thoughts and prayers of the entire Nation. In recent days many Senators have suggested that bombings should not be resumed until there is greater clarification about how they are advancing our national objectives.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may direct a query to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota with the understanding that I do not lose my rights to the floor and with the further understanding that the resumption of my speech shall not be regarded as a second speech on the same subject matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the observations of the Senator from Minnesota.

With reference to the bombing of North Vietnam, is it not true that Secretary McNamara and other say that, far from stopping the flow of North Vietnamese manpower into the theater of operations in the south, during all the months of bombings of North Vietnam, we have actually seen a very marked increase in the forces the North Vietnamese have thrown into the fray in the south?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator will recall that before the decision was made to start bombing North Vietnam, a number of Senators pointed out that the only way North Vietnam could respond to pressures of that kind would be on the ground. North Vietnam does not have the air power to retaliate effectively with air strikes so their one recourse to our bombings would be to commit more troops on the ground.

Does the Senator not feel that if we were to resume the bombing, the North Vietnamese would respond by greater efforts on the ground against our troops in the south?

Mr. McCARTHY. If we are to judge by what happened when bombings were undertaken in the past—and I would say this is the best information upon which we could make an estimate—it appears that the result of resumed or intensified bombing of North Vietnam, would be a substantial increase in ground forces used by the North Vietnamese.

Mr. McGOVERN. In reference to what the Senator has said concerning the confusion over our objectives in the Vietnamese conflict, one of the finest analyses of that problem was made in the Senate on yesterday by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], when she directed attention to a number of apparent conflicts in our present policy.

Our policymakers say that we would like to restore the Geneva settlement of 1954. Among other things, that agreement stated very clearly that the 17th parallel which now divides North and South Vietnam was a temporary military demarcation and was not "in any way to be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary."

Yet, we seem to be interpreting this conflict as a war between two separate countries, one on each side of the 17th parallel. As the Senator from Oregon said yesterday, our policymakers seem to be saying that we stand upon the principle that there is no political or territorial boundary separating North and South Vietnam, but that we must stand and fight in South Vietnam because it has been invaded by North Vietnam.

This is the kind of confusion that disturbs people all over the country concerning our policy in Vietnam.

Mr. McCARTHY. The cessation of the bombing has been accompanied by at least some effort toward reaching a settlement. None of these efforts has amounted to anything very positive over the past 3 or 4 weeks. However, I do not believe there is evidence that these efforts have run out of whatever strength or hope they possess. One of them may still sprout into something that might be more than a mere hope. As long as this hope remains, and as long as we are not absolutely certain that we are suffering a military loss and not absolutely certain that there is no diplomatic good to be gained in refraining from bombing, we ought not to resume bombing.

Mr. McGOVERN. As the Senator knows, our Government, I think very wisely, has enlisted the help of 30 or 40 other governments around the world in the search for a peaceful settlement of the war. Some of them are governments in central and eastern Europe. They are seeking to assist us in reaching a diplomatic settlement in Vietnam.

We have persuaded countries such as Yugoslavia and many others that one would expect to be on the other side of this issue to assist in the peace offensive.

All those countries, as the Senator knows, are opposed to a resumption of the bombing. They feel that they need time to persuade the government in Hanoi and others who have an interest in this struggle that a reasonable settlement can be negotiated with our Government.

It would seem to me that if we have

been willing to experiment for 5 or 6 years with a variety of military approaches, trying every strategy that anyone could think of to settle this conflict by military means, we ought to devote a few months of diplomacy to an effort to reach a settlement by some method other than bombing North Vietnam.

We have not stopped or slowed down our military effort in the south. As the Senator knows, the bombing has continued in South Vietnam. The ground action has continued. We have been putting in additional troops during the bombing pause in the north. So there has been no slowdown on our part of the military effort in the south. All our friends and our allies in other parts of the world are asking, at this point, is that we be patient while they join with us in trying to find some kind of a diplomatic breakthrough which may get discussions started.

It would seem to me that we should exercise at least as much patience and perseverance while the search for peace is going on as we have brought to the military effort over the past 5 or 6 years. That is especially true when, as the Senator points out, there is no evidence that the bombing attacks in the north have helped us, anyway. The only evidence we have is that there are more North Vietnamese soldiers fighting in the south today than there were when we started the bombing attacks last February.

We have not improved our diplomatic position, it seems to me, by the bombing attacks. Indeed, our whole policy is being seriously questioned in many other capitals around the world. There is almost united opposition around the world to a resumption of the bombing. I do not know how we can fly in the face of the clearly expressed position of many other friendly countries, including such important Asiatic nations as Japan, India, and Pakistan who have expressed strong opposition to a renewal of the bombing.

So I hope the Senator's remarks will receive the attention they deserve.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Carolina, without losing his right to the floor, would yield for me to add a name as cosponsor of a bill, and to make a brief comment and place a brief statement in the RECORD on the comments of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to my distinguished fellow Senator, reserving the right not to lose the floor, and that his remarks shall follow my remarks.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] for his thoughtful contribution to the dialog about our situation in Vietnam. The Senator from Minnesota, whenever he speaks, always makes a fruitful and creative contribution to our deliberations, and I am pleased to commend him for it.

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1249

I appreciate the trying circumstances in which we find ourselves in Vietnam, and the tremendous burden which is being borne by the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, in providing leadership under such circumstances.

I think it is clear that, in general, our country has three broad choices: One of them is to withdraw from Vietnam, a choice of which I do not approve. Another is to stay in Vietnam and continue to filibuster along, so to speak, without escalating the conflict in terms of our manpower on the ground or in the air. A third general alternative is to make a massive commitment to a land involvement in Asia, which, in order to impose a purely military solution, surely would require anywhere from 700,000 to a million men, in a bloody war, with the risk of bringing China into the conflict.

Out of these three choices, no one of which is a very desirable choice, I think this country is much better off to retain its present position, continue for the time being without the resumption of strategic bombing in the north, and continue to seek negotiations for an honorable settlement. It may very well be that political or military circumstances will develop which will necessitate the resumption of bombing in the north. If so, that decision can be made when the time comes. But for the time being, I think it would be the better part of wisdom to continue as the President has continued for the past few weeks without strategic bombing, and seeking to get to the conference table.

I conclude by again thanking the Senator from Minnesota for his very thoughtful contribution.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

I think we should note that the fact that many Senators have spoken out on the side of not resuming the bombing is not necessarily to be interpreted in any way against the Commander in Chief, who, we are assured and reassured, is trying to solve the problem. It would be no help to him if Senators who felt that bombing should not be resumed were to say they were in favor of bombing; and certainly it would be of no help to him if we were to say nothing to indicate our judgment.

The President is trying to make a hard decision. By letting him know the position taken by Members of the Senate in support of withholding bombing or of resuming bombing, we are being, in my judgment, of service to the President of the United States.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield another moment or two to me?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I, along with a large number of other Members of Congress, approved the President's decision for the cessation of bombing, and have approved his continuance of that policy.

The question being raised now is a tactical one, as to whether or not this is the best moment to resume bombing. I believe the Senator is perfectly correct, that what we are doing is discuss-

ing the issue of whether or not this is the best moment to resume bombing. I happen to believe that we would be better off if we continued for some further length of time exploring possible alternatives.

Mr. President, I made a statement on this matter on January 15. I ask unanimous consent that my statement of that date be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR NELSON'S STATEMENT ON VIETNAM
JANUARY 15, 1966

There are no easy answers to the agonizing dilemma facing America in Vietnam. But of all the grim alternatives, it seems to me the wisest is to continue with great patience to seek a negotiated settlement while firmly refusing to escalate the conflict further. This is essentially a political and not a military conflict. It is a battle in Vietnam for the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese. It must be limited to Vietnam, and be fought by the Vietnamese if we are to have any realistic hope of an acceptable settlement. For along the open ended path of further escalation lies the specter of a major land war in Asia fought with U.S. troops, a war against which our best military minds—including the late Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur—have repeatedly warned us. It has long been my view that our commitment should never be expanded to make that conflict an American war. And in a major speech last May 6, I pointed out that, despite a tendency to characterize people as "hawks and doves," most Americans including most Members of Congress are united behind these major principles: There must be no major land war in Asia; the problems of Vietnam must be settled eventually by negotiations; and the main responsibility for stable government must rest with the South Vietnamese people.

The situation is even more dangerous today than it was in May. And the pressures to escalate the war are growing in many quarters. But I believe these cardinal principles should guide our policy. Even if a million American soldiers were to force all North Vietnamese units from South Vietnam and to suppress the Vietcong guerrillas with napalm and bayonets—even if we avoided an open clash with Red China—even then, when we withdrew as eventually we must, we would leave behind us only a charred, desolate country with little hope that it could maintain its independence one moment beyond the time we left.

There is no point in criticizing the mistakes of past policy. But it is crucial in looking toward the future to recall that our military advisers have been consistently overoptimistic when not actually dead wrong in their public statements of the Vietnamese situation. Secretary of Defense McNamara's estimate that the Americans could begin to pull out by Christmas 1965 is only the most famous example.

Those who look for a cheap victory through airpower should recall the glowing assurances last February that a few bombs on North Vietnam would quickly bring that country to the conference table in a tractable mood. If anything, the opposite has been the case.

George F. Kennan, the former Ambassador and noted foreign policy expert, has recently advocated an effort to deescalate the war, to simmer down the situation in Vietnam. In a world where a nuclear holocaust is a distinct possibility, the survival of us all depends on containing armed conflict to as narrow an area as possible. This is indeed sound advice.

President Johnson has taken a long step toward localizing the war and achieving ne-

gotiations by calling a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam. He deserves praise and support for his continued efforts to find peace in Vietnam.

It is crucial that the war in Vietnam not be allowed to escalate further. Now is the time to make every conscientious effort to deescalate the conflict. For in escalation there is no practical hope of achieving our aims in that unfortunate country and a very real possibility of an Asianwide war in which America would waste her resources and young men in a slaughter that could achieve nothing but those desperate conditions of chaos ideal for the spread of communism.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much for his courtesy.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION
14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR
RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to repeat the latter part of my remarks on a declaration of human rights that was adopted by the United Nations in 1948.

In 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I wish to state at this point that the very thing we have been debating here today; that is, the right-to-work laws, is a declaration of human rights, about work.

We are not talking about the kind of work that horses, mules, or some other animals do. We are talking about human rights and the right to work. The Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations declared in article XX, section 1:

Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

Section 2 asserts:

No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Even George Meany, who so strongly opposes right-to-work laws, when speaking to the United Nations in his initial address as a delegate, stated:

The extent to which any society is truly humanitarian, democratic rather than paternalistic, depends in very large measure on the initiative and energy displayed by the voluntary organizations in the community, on the extent to which the people themselves through organizations of their own choice and direction mold the domestic and foreign policies of their country.

That statement was made in a speech to the United Nations concerning not only the United States but all the nations, which of course includes the people of this country.

Certainly this principle so ably enunciated by him can be related not only to such voluntary organizations as churches, service clubs, lodges, chambers

of commerce, but also to union organizations as well.

President John F. Kennedy signed a law on March 15, 1961, which by clear implication recognized the inherent strength of the right-to-work principle. I refer to the Manpower Development and Training Act, which had received the prior endorsement of Secretary of Labor Goldberg, and to section 307 of the statute which provides:

"The selection of persons for training under this Act and for placement of such persons shall not be contingent upon such person's membership or nonmembership in a labor organization.

The nations of the world regard the United States as the citadel of democracy and individual liberty, an image which will be tarnished if, by legal recognition of compulsory unionism, we become, except for nations inside the Iron Curtain, the only major power to reject voluntarism. Compulsory unionism is prohibited by the constitutions, laws or judicial decisions of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Western Germany.

Proponents of the repeal of section 14(b) argue that they merely desire to create the situation where unions and employers may freely enter into compulsory membership contracts. As a practical matter the word "freely" is a misnomer. There is bargaining on wages and fringe benefits. There is no bargaining on the union shop, as applied particularly to the smaller employer. The employer is reduced to the position of saying yes or no. If he says no and sticks to it, he must expect a strike or picketing. A retailer, for example, is more vulnerable to strikes and picketing than employers in other industries. When pickets appear, it usually means the cutting off of incoming merchandise and thereby the ending of sales to his customers. When a store is shut down or customers do not cross a picket line, the merchant loses many customers whom he may never regain. Those lost sales are never recouped because competitors can satisfy the customer's needs.

Therefore, against his own conviction, a small merchant is easily forced to agree to compulsory membership and dues check off. So are some of the large retail organizations.

It is argued that employers often agree to compulsory membership in exchange for a better break on wage and fringe benefits—the so-called sweetheart contract.

Strange as it may seem, this is true. The unions get dues, the employer saves on payroll, and the employees lose. Furthermore, when recognition is based on a card check and the union does have a card majority, the employee has no additional loss. He has heard only the union arguments. There has been no free speech.

A March 15, 1965, article in the U.S. News & World Report states the present NLRB policy with respect to the right of employees and employers to an election. The cases cited by the author are recent and the trend to reliance upon card checks is increasing.

While Congress is struggling to secure the right to vote for all Americans, the NLRB is eliminating such right for the American workingman in determining union representation through the process of secret ballot elections.

The card check—at one time regarded as the preliminary to sweetheart contracts—has, in the Board's opinion, become most respectable.

In 1947, Congress clearly indicated its objection to card checks when it deleted from section 9(c) of the Taft-Hartley Act, "or utilize any other suitable method to ascertain such representatives."

A brief history of the landmark cases leading to the present NLRB policy follows: In *Joy Silk Mills* 24 LRRM 1548 decided September 13, 1949, the Board held that an employer may be required to bargain with a union without an election where:

First, the union has secured membership or authorization cards from the majority of the employees before demanding recognition; second, the employer insists upon an election not because of a good faith doubt of majority, but to gain time in which to dissipate that majority by unfair labor practices; and, third, the employer then embarks upon a campaign of unfair labor practices to destroy that majority.

It is hard to quarrel with the decision in *Joy Silk* and the hundreds of cases based thereon, although the act provides other methods of relief and the case marked a departure from the time-honored secret ballot election requirement. As a remedy to be used only in the most extreme cases of employer unfair labor practices, the decision can be supported.

The next landmark case was *Aiello Dairy*, 35 LRRM 1235, decided in December 1954. This case and many following cases based upon it hold that the union has alternative remedies. If the union knows that the employer is engaging in unfair labor practices which may destroy its card majority it may either file refusal to bargain charges or petition the NLRB for an election. It cannot do both. It cannot lose the election and then obtain bargaining rights by filing unfair labor practice charges.

In *Bernal Foam Products* 56 LRRM 1039, decided in May 1964, the rule of election of remedies provided by the *Aiello Dairy* was reversed. The union lost the election by a vote of 55 to 34. It then filed refusal to bargain charges and the Board required the employer to bargain.

Briefly, the facts were: First, when the union demanded bargaining by the employer prior to the election, it had 53 of the 88 employees' signatures to membership or authorization cards; second, the union suggested a card check by a disinterested third party and the employer replied that he would not bargain without the majority first being established in a secret ballot election conducted by the NLRB; and the employer did commit unfair labor practices prior to the election.

A little noticed decision *Snow and Sons*, 49 LRRM 1228, decided in November 1961, fills out the background. In *Snow and Sons* the employer agreed to a card

check against its payroll by a neutral third party. The card check showed that 31 of the 49 employees had signed cards. The employer then said he wanted a secret ballot election and refused to bargain. The Board ordered the employer to bargain with the union. The Board found no unfair labor practice, no conduct to destroy the majority. The employer did nothing—just demanded a secret ballot election. If the case is considered just as union versus employer, perhaps there is something wrong about the employer changing his mind. But what about the rights of the employees? Some of those 31 cards may have been forgeries. Some may have been signed just to obtain an election. Some may have been signed by employees who intended to vote against the union. Some may have been signed because others in the car pool signed. Some may have been signed by employees who did not know what they were signing. The list of motivation for card signing could go on indefinitely. It has been demonstrated on many occasions that one can stand on a street corner of any city and obtain signatures to any petition. True, in *Snow and Sons* the union had six cards more than a majority. But in more recent cases, a majority of one has been held sufficient.

In just 2 days—June 29 and 30, 1964—the Board decided three cases under the new rules. The cases were *Fleming and Sons*, 56 LRRM 1395; *Sabine Vending*, 56 LRRM 1386; and *Flomatic Corp.*, 56 LRRM 1391. In *Flomatic* there was not even a request for bargaining by the union. The union had a card majority when it wrote a letter to the employer saying that it would petition for an election if the employer did not reply to its request for a meeting. Two days later the union did file an election petition; the employer consented to an election and the union lost. The Board found the employer to have made mild, implied promises which a prior Board might well have considered to be "free speech." The Board required the employer to bargain with the union when and if it requested bargaining.

Two cases decided in February 1955, *Indiana Rayon*, 58 LRRM 1348, and *Purity Food Stores*, 58 LRRM 1294, illustrate the continuation of the trend. In *Indiana Rayon* the union had 119 cards in a unit of 236 on the day of its bargaining demand. The union filed an election petition and the employer consented to an election which the union lost by a vote of 120 to 85. The Board ordered bargaining, finding that the employer had committed minor violations of the act. There has not been sufficient review by the courts to determine just how far they will permit the Board to go in ordering bargaining on a card-determined majority, but generally they appear to support the Board. In *Winn-Dixie Stores*, 58 LRRM 2475, decided February 27, 1965, the Sixth Circuit affirmed the Board's bargaining order where the union had sent photostatic copies of cards to the employer with its bargaining demand.

The cards counted up to a majority of one. The cards could have been con-

Alaska villages. Its value is more than an appraisal of its permanent buildings and downtown land. As such, a decision as to whether the riverbanks should be protected to save the community seems outside the bounds of normal cost-benefit ratios established by the Corps of Engineers. Here is one project the special commission could undertake immediately. There are doubtless others similar in nature.

These are suggestions for a commission agenda. Together they would spell an end to the patronizing, paternalistic relationship that exists today and has existed for decades between the native and his Government. Federal help, yes. But Federal help designed to permit him to be self-reliant.

Until that occurs—until the native has opportunities for education, employment, and leadership equal to his paper rights—he will not be free.

He will be trapped on an invisible reservation, a reservation where he can remain alive but never has a chance to live.

It does not have to be that way. The Alaska native has too noble a heritage to be considered less than equal. He is too close to spanning the gap between cultures to endure the present situation much longer. Now is the time for action.

That's the way we, the staff of the Anchorage Daily News, see it.

SPEECH BY PRIME MINISTER KY BEFORE VIETNAM ARMED FORCES CONGRESS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague, Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, for inserting into the RECORD the text of the important speech presented by Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky to the closing session of the Vietnam Armed Forces Congress on January 15, 1966.

Far from being a "tinhorn Asian dictator" as some Members of this body have unfairly characterized him, the Prime Minister of South Vietnam has proven himself a thoughtful and forceful leader.

Prime Minister Ky does not engage in wishful thinking in this speech. He recognizes the difficulties ahead, and is mindful of the areas of failure during the previous 200 days of his administration.

Yet his speech is an optimistic one precisely because his administration has achieved notable gains in many areas. He points out that in contrast to the military situation of 1 year ago, "allied troops have completely in hand the initiative of operations at every battlefront, and the tide of the war has turned in our favor."

General Ky is aware that the battle in Vietnam is not a military one alone.

Three rural electrification pilot cooperatives were established in Tuyen Duc, AF Giang, and Duc Tu.

Four hundred taxicabs and 200 tri-lambrettas were imported in part of the government program to sell these vehicles on an installment basis to the drivers. A number of construction projects are now underway, and the public works and communications department built 554 single-story housing units at Vinh Hoi and Tan Qui Dong alone.

Nearly 460,434 refugees have been resettled and an educational reform movement has been launched. General Ky states:

As another evidence of the government's efforts in the rural education field, outstanding students from low-income families will be granted official scholarships thus enabling worthy students to complete their secondary education.

As his goals the Prime Minister calls for the defeat of the Vietcong, a stabilization of the economic situation and the building of democracy. A democracy building council will soon be set up, and plans for free elections have been made.

Those who idly compare General Ky and his government with the tyranny he opposes are misreading history. It is time to make clear that although the South Vietnamese Government at this time may not be as strong or as representative or as democratic as we hope it will eventually be, that there will never be any hope of a free and democratic South Vietnam if communism is imposed upon the Vietnamese people.

There is no chance for a free election under communism, and there will be no land reform under communism, and no economic improvement for the people. There will simply be a brutal tyranny.

General Ky provides us with hope and a substantial record of achievement thus far. I, too, commend his words to the consideration of my colleagues.

BOB HOPE—NATIONAL TREASURE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, because of his continued and patriotic unselfishness over the Christmas holidays for a number of years, and the happiness he has brought to millions of people, in this country and all over the world, Bob Hope could well be the most popular man on earth.

Millions of young Americans will never forget the happiness of laughing with him while they were serving overseas; and as those who watched his show from South Vietnam the other evening saw, he can also be wise in serious comment.

All this was either well said or implied in a recent editorial in the Kansas City Star "Bob Hope Goes to War Again."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOB HOPE GOES TO WAR AGAIN

Bob Hope kept seeing familiar faces during his Christmas visit to U.S. servicemen in Vietnam. The combat forces include many an oldtimer who, like Hope, is a veteran of three wars. At Da Nang the marine commander, Maj. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, remarked: "This is the third battlefield I've had the pleasure of meeting Bob Hope on." The other meetings were during World War II and in Korea.

We suppose that many a young American in Vietnam who wrote home about seeing the Hope troupe perform at Christmastime was not even born when his own father laughed at Bob's quips overseas during the Second World War. For 25 years the amazingly indefatigable Hope has been entertaining the troops. Every year brings another exhausting tour—Greenland, Berlin, Guantanamo, the Far East. Hope is as regular as Santa Claus, and funnier.

The man is a national treasure, bless him.

REPORT ON VIETNAM BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, on both of which committees I have the honor to serve, with respect to my trip to South Vietnam, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Attached is a 123-page report of my 10-day visit to South Vietnam, December 28–January 6 inclusive. I was accompanied by Lt. Col. Edward Peter, Army Legislative Liaison.

Also attached is a statement made upon my return January 10; plus a statement about the Central Intelligence Agency made on the floor January 14.

The table of contents summarizes the places visited, including a visit to Thailand.

In a previous visit the first part of December, as a member of the Eugene Black party incident to the signing of the Asian Development Bank agreement in Manila, I also went to Thailand, where I had two additional days with the Ambassador, the Central Intelligence people, and the military, visiting various bases incident to the functions of the latter.

On this first trip I also visited Japan; and in addition, the Philippines, Guam (from which the current B-52 strikes originate) and Hawaii.

In the latter State I was briefed by CINCPAC; also spent a day watching the realistic and effective training of the 25th Division in the mountains of Hawaii. Part of that division is now in South Vietnam.

Starting with Colonel Peter from Hawaii, we again visited Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan, Hong Kong and the United Arab Republic. A report on our visit to these countries is nearly completed and well be sent to you shortly.

In each country we discussed at length the international aspects of our current policies and programs with the U.S. Ambassadors and/or Ministers, with the representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency, and with the military; also with members of the other government in question.

Then we decided to fly back, rather than have the sharp edges of our impressions blurred by visits previously planned to Turkey, Naples, Germany, NATO in Paris, and Great Britain.

I am sending the attached report to the Defense Department, asking that as much as possible be declassified for publication.

Because so much has already been spoken and written about our past, present, and possible future actions in South Vietnam, it was felt that a day-to-day account of our activities might be the better way to make a report. Certain conclusions based on our findings, however, are listed as follows:

Cooperation and understanding between the services is excellent.

Representation of this Government by Ambassador Lodge is of the highest caliber. He is universally respected by the South Vietnamese Government as well as by our own civilian and military leaders.

General Westmoreland is handling the military operations in the highest tradition of the armed services. He also was a wise

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1227

few native ghettos and no government complex to wall off the two cultures.

And some have succeeded in integrating fully into the new life:

Ralph Perdue, president of the Tanana Chiefs Council and owner of a Fairbanks jewelry store.

Emil Nottli, president of the Cook Inlet Native Association and electronics engineer for the Bureau of Land Management.

Roy Snyder, currently station mechanic foreman for the Federal Aviation Agency in Nome. A daughter is a practicing physician.

Flory Lekanof, a BIA schoolteacher, now assigned to Unalakleet. He has a master's degree in education.

Parker Nation, who grew up in a mission at Nenana and now works as a mechanic for the Federal Aviation Agency at Anchorage.

Walter Riley, who grew up at the same mission and is a truckdriver at Fort Richardson.

Gene Williams is a graduate of the University of Washington and now works at the Alaska Native Medical Center at Anchorage.

These and other natives have managed to carve a place for themselves in a largely nonnative society. They represent a growing middle class: people who can hold their own and speak their minds.

More and more, the native is speaking for himself.

The role and place of Alaska's native people in the State must be better understood—by native and nonnative alike, according to Gov. William Egan.

"They (the village people) must be treated as equal citizens of the State—equal in intelligence and ability," the Governor said.

It is useful, Egan said, that all Alaskans respect the capabilities of the native people and work toward building their confidence in their ability to operate their own projects without "somebody standing over them."

Egan said there is no question in his mind that the State could do a better job of operating schools for its native children than the Federal Government.

He stressed the "differences" that are fostered and continued under two separate programs of education, health and other services.

The sooner the State can assume full responsibility for the education of all of its children, the better off "all of us are going to be," Egan said.

He said the State is moving toward the takeover of additional Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Egan said he authorized that approximately 15 more such schools would come under State direction by the end of 1967.

Such a takeover is mainly a matter of financing, he said.

He said he is in favor of the Federal Government turning over annually to the State those funds it now uses to operate its programs.

Egan said he did not know of any other part of the country where such a program is in operation.

"The time has come, I think," the Governor added, "that a down-to-earth approach must be made in recognizing that all the citizens of the United States have an obligation to the people who live in the villages in the matter of education, welfare and health."

The Governor expressed the view that the series "The Village People," running in the Anchorage Daily News, takes an objective approach to the problem of the native.

"It reaches right down into the heart of the thing," Egan said.

PART 11. THE FUTURE

Yesterday's installment of "The Village People" was the last in the series.

No. 12—6

What follows should not be considered a presentation of facts, but rather a presentation of opinion—the collective opinion of members of the Anchorage Daily News editorial staff.

It had not been our intention to conclude this series with recommendations. Our purpose has been to inform our readers about the Alaska native. He represents one-fourth the civilian population of Alaska. And he is rarely heard from.

But after months of study, travel, and conservation, we have formed some opinions and ideas. These we must publish also.

Most of Alaska's 50,000 Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians live in the villages. Some areas, some villages, are advancing under their own power. But the vast majority are not, particularly on the western coast and in the interior.

The population is increasing rapidly in an area where subsistence living—the historic life of the north—is consistently more difficult. The native can no longer live in the old way. And as he and his children become more acquainted with modern civilization, the old way no longer seems desirable.

In these areas poverty is a way of life—perhaps as deeply embedded as in any place under the American flag. Welfare checks take the place of jobs. Though there are schools, educational achievement remains low. Alcohol and tuberculosis take a tremendous toll. Most homes are substandard. There is a high expectancy of failure among the population.

This condition, it seems to us, is a national blind spot. For decades the Federal Government has been in the villages with schools and nurses and social workers. What exists today is self-evident proof that the present system is not sufficient. Decades of good intentions have not produced notable results. It eventually could be one of our greatest international embarrassments.

It does not seem to us that the problem is beyond solution or that any solution need be thought of in terms of generations. And it is not enough to say that the people that must help themselves. The native people of Alaska have been among the most self-reliant on earth—their climate and way of life demanded it. What they lack now are the tools for becoming self-reliant in the new culture.

Historically the Bureau of Indian Affairs has administered to the Alaska native. It has provided his education, welfare, store loans, and other necessities. But no native leader today fails to be critical of the BIA. Among the people it is designed to serve, it apparently is discredited.

Something else is needed, probably the State of Alaska, which is moving slowly into the realm of native affairs—a transfer of power which generally draws native acceptance.

For the present, however, the State is finding it difficult to assume too large an economic burden in this respect. And some needs will be beyond the State's power to fulfill for years to come.

When the full transfer comes, the house should be in order. The only power to accomplish that now exists at the Federal level.

We believe that nothing less is required, immediately, than a Presidential commission for the Alaska native. Such a commission should be headed by a nationally respected figure. It should look at the record, talk to the native people, and transcend the authority of existing agencies to set up machinery for the restoration of the Alaska native to a place of equality and dignity.

There is precedent for it. After the March 1964 earthquake, the President organized a special reconstruction commission headed by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

The Commission was ably staffed and went to work with determination. Because of it, agency lines were erased, bills were passed by Congress, and most recovery efforts—half a billion dollars worth—were accomplished rapidly.

That is what is needed for the Alaska native.

Here are some of the things such a commission could achieve:

Jobs: The U.S. Government is the primary employer of people in the Alaska bush country. Yet many of its most attractive jobs are beyond the reach of people in the area. Employees for the FAA or Weather Bureau or other installations are hired elsewhere, trained elsewhere, and sent to an Alaska outpost for temporary hardship duty. It is not inconceivable that local people could be hired, trained elsewhere, and returned home to permanent employment at no increased cost. By altering hiring practices, it seems that the U.S. Government could be a better employer of local people. It is certainly an area the State should consider, too. Alaska often speaks of its special situation in relation to other States. It should also recognize special situations within its borders.

The total problem will never be solved until the area has a sufficient economic base. By building roads and harbors in selected areas it would be possible to tap the natural resources of the regions involved and influence future development.

Education: The State should take over administration of all rural schools at the earliest possible time. This commission could help speed up the timetable by working out a program for financing this transfer.

A program for training native students to be teachers in their home villages or village area could be established. And if this required a reduction in minimum standards to be effective immediately, it seems that the benefits—having a person who understands the culture and the problems and who can be an example to the people—outweigh this consideration.

Land: A commission of this type could arrange for settling the longstanding Alaska land problem.

Birth control: This commission could do for the Alaska native what the United States is doing for underdeveloped nations of the world—provide information and assistance in birth control. No such program exists today for the Alaska native, whose birth rate is the highest in the world.

Housing: In some villages people who have good jobs cannot secure loans for home construction because the home—without water and sewage—would not meet FHA standards. In other villages few have jobs and live huddled together—perhaps a dozen to a house—in one room. There is a Federal housing program for virtually everyone in the United States except the Alaska native. Senator BARTLETT has introduced legislation in Congress to correct this situation. The commission could give this measure significant backing.

Tourism: There is a tremendous potential for the Alaska native in Alaska's growing tourist industry. But he needs help in marketing his arts and crafts. The commission here could be of immediate assistance.

Welfare: While we did not survey the native welfare program closely enough to form hard and fast judgments, there are indications that it works against self-reliance, discourages natives from securing temporary jobs and encourages larger families, whether or not the mother is married. This program should be carefully reviewed to see whether the stated aims of the programs are being achieved.

Projects: Bethel is the economic, transportation, cultural, health, and communications center for 15,000 people in southwest

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1229

choice, especially because of his intense interest in the problems of the South Vietnamese civilians.

Morale in the military is high. Unless our mission becomes more clear, however, this might not continue at the same high level among lower echelons.

There are logistic shortages, some serious but none critical; and there has been a marked improvement in that condition during recent weeks. The future of adequate supplying depends primarily upon (a) the ability to improve the unloading of ships at the various ports and (b) the nature and degree of the planned buildup.

Once more, there is a clear demonstration of the vital importance of air power. The C-130 is literally priceless in a country with practically no railroad capacity and so many at least periodically interdicted roads. It is difficult to visualize today how past military operations were ever conducted without helicopters.

Air operations in South Vietnam in support of ground troops have been effective; in fact, no one believes the present operations could have been conducted at all without this air power (naval air strength and Army air strength are of course included).

Air operations against North Vietnam have been relatively ineffective to the point where these operations should not be resumed unless there is more target license; license to hit such military targets as powerplants, oil stores, docks, and so forth.

The long coastline of Vietnam gives full opportunity for utilization of our superior naval power. That superiority, however, is not being adequately utilized.

There should be programs to reduce, if not eliminate, the sanctuary aspects of Laos and Cambodia. Both countries are being utilized by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese to transport men and equipment to South Vietnam; and also as sanctuaries. In both countries there are Communist headquarters.

The current limited military operations are very expensive and can only become steadily more expensive. The United States is carrying this economic load with little assistance from any nation of the free world, and no assistance from most. These other countries should assume more of this cost in manpower and money.

Those who urge greater effort on the part of this administration to attain peace at the conference table—plus continued cessation of military effort—generally acknowledge that they are not suggesting the United States withdraw from South Vietnam.

In a world telescoped in time and space to the point where "every country is now in the next county," one in which "spheres of influence" is now a relatively obsolete term, these statements promote an unwillingness to negotiate, because others interpret in them a weakening of the will of this Nation to carry on the struggle.

If South Vietnam is not the right place to defend the free world against totalitarian aggression, we should retire from that country on the best terms possible. This would probably result in a Communist takeover of additional countries and would damage seriously the world position and status of the United States. That would be the price, but it would not be catastrophic.

If South Vietnam is the right place to defend the free world against totalitarian aggression, however, then that fact should be recognized in more practical fashion. We cannot continue indefinitely the plans and programs incident to the current holding operation. After 25 years of almost continuous war, the South Vietnamese have lost much of the best of their manhood. They are tired and the gigantic cost to us is also very costly to them.

This conflict constitutes the fourth time in 20 years that the United States accepted

the splitting of the boundaries of a country; and then remained to bear most if not all of the cost—billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of people. Regardless of the wisdom of those decisions, the effect on our economy is inescapable.

In the current conflict we conscientiously consider how our moves may affect the actions of the Red Chinese. At times it would seem there is undue preoccupation with this question and it is fair to ask whether this strengthens or weakens our capacity for decision. If the latter is true, how much more so will it be true when a few years hence China becomes a nuclear power?

The time is approaching when we must decide—while the decision is still ours to make—whether we will move forward or move out. Whichever course we choose, we must take it with courage, with skill, and with realism. We must be equally realistic about the consequences of avoiding this difficult choice.

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

SYMINGTON PREPARING REPORT ON TRIP TO VIETNAM AND PACIFIC AREAS

WASHINGTON, January 10.—Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, who returned to Washington last night following 6 weeks in the Pacific area, including an intensive 10 days in South Vietnam, started working today on a report he will file with the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. He is a member of both committees.

Commenting about his visit to Vietnam, SYMINGTON said: "Certain conclusions stand out—the high caliber and morale of our American representatives, civilian as well as military; the magnificent cooperation between the services, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines, plus the great respect they have for each other; the improved cooperation and understanding, at all levels, under the leadership of General Ky and Ambassador Lodge, between the representatives of the Government of South Vietnam and our representatives."

The Missouri Senator said he planned to withhold further comment on Vietnam until completing his report for the committees.

Since Thanksgiving, SYMINGTON has visited foreign and U.S. officials and military missions not only in South Vietnam but also in Japan, Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, Okinawa, Taiwan and Hong Kong, Guam, Hawaii and Alaska.

In Vietnam, SYMINGTON's inquiry included numerous trips in the field. He met with key commanders, combat troops, combat support and service units and also visited with U.S. servicemen in the hospitals. SYMINGTON arrived in Saigon on Tuesday morning, December 28, and left there Thursday afternoon, January 6.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

During my recent trip abroad, I was afforded the opportunity of looking over the programs and activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in many countries. Prior to departure, I received extensive briefings from the Agency and during my trip talked in detail with all Agency representatives in the country in question, as has been my custom in past years when visiting abroad.

All felt the latter's programs were fully coordinated with United States policy of the Agency with every Ambassador. In every case, no exception, the Ambassador expressed his complete approval of the functioning of the Agency.

I found no instances of any kind where CIA activities were uncontrolled, or contrary to United States policy. Indeed it would appear difficult, if not impossible, for such uncontrolled activities to occur. This belief is based on existing coordination procedures and policy directives stemming from

the Washington level, plus the controls applicable to field activities.

I have always been impressed, in my contacts with the Agency, with the integrity and professional competence of its representatives. Only twice, in over 10 years, have I found anything to the contrary. Based on the present rules, I doubt if those cases of disagreement could now be duplicated.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to present to the Senate the fact that I agree with Secretary Rusk who, in talking about CIA people, stated: "There is a good deal of gallantry and a high degree of competence in those who have to help us deal with that part of the struggle for freedom."

The Central Intelligence Agency has a difficult, and at times a very dangerous mission to perform. Not all men, or women, of this or any other agency, are perfect, and it is easy to criticize any group which cannot defend itself because of the nature of its work. Nevertheless it is my considered judgment that the American public should be proud of this organization and its people, a group who serve our country with unstinting devotion.

In addition to this brief report, which of necessity must be general, I am also reporting my findings and conclusions in more detail to Chairman RUSSELL and the Subcommittee for the CIA of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

SKI RESORTS OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, New Mexico has many assets, and one of them that is little-known is its outstanding ski resorts. Alex Katz, a reporter for the Chicago Sun-Times, visited several of our winter resorts recently and came back filled with praise for what he found.

I ask unanimous consent that his report to the readers of the Sun-Times be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Jan. 21, 1966]

NEW MEXICO AREAS RISING AS TOP SKI RESORTS

(By Alex Katz)

SANTE FE, N. MEX.—In the minds of most Americans, New Mexico's image is one of glaring deserts and Indians who live in pueblos and sell silver jewelry to tourists.

But to a growing number of knowledgeable winter sports enthusiasts, New Mexico is becoming a skier's paradise without crowded slopes and long lift lines.

For years New Mexico's Department of Development has plugged the State's sunshine and climate. The sunshine and climate haven't changed, of course, but now attention is being given to snow-covered peaks that soar to 13,000 feet and the skiers they attract.

TOUGH SKI RUNS

Some of the toughest ski runs in the Nation can be found at Taos Ski Valley, 18 miles northeast of the famed artists' town of Taos.

This season Ernie Blake, the hard-working Swiss who operates Taos Ski Valley, installed a second double chair lift. The addition of this chair lift, 3,400 feet long, virtually doubles the amount of skiable terrain.

And what terrain!

A huge bowl, certain to afford excellent protected skiing all winter and into late spring is now accessible with the new lift.

On a tour of the bowl last week, this writer watched Blake thrust a ski pole, handle first, into the snow to record its depth. The 52-inch pole sank almost out of sight.

The headwall that rises above the bowl is something only experts should try. A few skiers have already offered a selection of names for the brute. Among them: Tucker-man's West, Reforma, and Kamikaze.

SOME CHANGES

Elsewhere in Taos Ski Valley, changes are being made. The new ski shop handles rentals and sales without a hitch. Down the road a condominium apartment building is being built to ease the housing demands and another is planned for next season at a spot directly above the beginners' area.

The Blake version of the United Nations continues to appeal to skiers who have learned that Taos Ski Valley offers a cosmopolitan approach to the sport. Five nations—the United States, Switzerland, France, Finland, and Germany—are represented in the 16-man ski school.

Only recently the State approved the establishment of the Taos Air Taxi which offers speedy flight service to Taos for skiers arriving at Albuquerque's new Sunport via Trans World Airlines jets.

Just 16 miles from Santa Fe, the oldest State capital in the Nation, is Santa Fe Ski Basin. Texans and Oklahomans in great numbers have discovered the pleasure of skiing at Santa Fe Ski Basin and enjoying the comforts of the accommodations in the nearby city.

Plans are underway for the construction of a lodge at the ski development.

EXTENDED SEASON

The base at Santa Fe Ski Basin is at an altitude of about 10,000 feet, assuring good snow conditions for an extended season. Four lifts serve the area: two double chair lifts and two Poma lifts. Eleven major trails are spread across the slopes which have a vertical drop of up to 1,700 feet.

Harvey Chalker, well-known to Chicago ski show visitors, is manager of the area. Kingsbury Pitcher, veteran in the field of ski area management, operates the ski development. A ski school with certified instructors is on duty daily and is augmented by a corps of associate certified teachers on weekends.

Residents of the booming city of Albuquerque merely have to drive 18 miles northeast to ski at Sandia Peak. A double chair lift soars 7,600 feet along the spine of this enormous mountain.

Better skiers will enjoy the Exhibition run, so named because it is directly below the chair lift line where every rider can check the style and technique of fellow skiers.

Most of the skiing at Sandia Peak will suit intermediates. The vertical drop on the Exhibition, Aspen, and Cibola runs is 1,750 feet.

SANDIA'S 30TH YEAR

This is Sandia Peak's 30th year of operation, and the highlight of the celebration should come in March when an aerial tramway, 2.7 miles long, is expected to go into operation.

The tramway will have two 60-passenger cars and will take skiers from the valley to the top of the ski area in only 10 minutes.

Three of the four major cables to carry the cars are in place. The fourth is ready for stringing with the aid of a helicopter.

A view from the top of Sandia Peak affords a spectacular glimpse of several mountain ranges, the city of Albuquerque, and the Rio Grande. The tram will operate all year.

Other ski areas in New Mexico include Red River, Sipapu, Raton, Sierra Blanca, and Cloudercroft. The skiing is excellent. The only problem is getting skiers to believe it.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, this year the President's Economic Report is able to present the welcome news that American agriculture is sharing fully in

the great economic advance of the Nation's economy. One remarkable statistic sums up this progress: Last year, 1965, the net income of farm proprietors advanced by 23 percent. Rarely in our past history have farmers made that kind of progress in a single year.

The average net income of farmers is the most appropriate measure of farm prosperity. Gross farm income in billions of dollars pays no attention to the costs farmers incur in producing this gross income, nor to the number of farmers who must share in it. The old parity price ratios that used to be taken as a guide to farm prosperity pay no attention to the increase in farm productivity.

Agricultural policy is one of the most complex problems that this Nation or any nation faces. I say "any nation," because the United States is not alone in recognizing that its farm sector has special problems, and that the prosperity of agriculture cannot be left completely to the mechanical operation of a free market.

American farm policy, however, has clearly been moving in new directions—successful directions. Success is shown by the rise in farm incomes. And success is shown by the significant reduction in our surplus stocks of farm products. Judging by these results I should say that our farm policies are finally on the right track.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14 (b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703 (b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and suggest that the staff be notified that it will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 15 Leg.]

Aiken	Holland	Muskie
Allott	Inouye	Neuberger
Bartlett	Jackson	Proxmire
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Dominick	Mansfield	Talmadge
Douglas	McClellan	Thurmond
Gruening	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hayden	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DODD, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is recognized.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator if I may do so without losing my rights to the floor and without the resumption of my speech being considered a second speech on the pending subject matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

1

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

January 27, 1966

went up to a dollar a pound and above. See the demand pull? They had the money, the hogs were not there, and they started bidding against each other to get that bacon.

That, of course, is what I am afraid of in this general economic picture. I am getting a little bit away from 14(b). I think we should be discussing the budget and the war, giving priority to the war and wondering how we can fight it without inflation. But in the great wisdom of those who run this debating society, or the greatest deliberative body in the world, whichever we may wish to call it, this is the time and place to take up the repeal of 14(b). Much as I had rather be doing something else, I am here to say that taking up 14(b) does not meet with my approval.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator answer another question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. If I can.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the union has a right to put a maximum limit upon how much a worker may produce, does it not follow that it also has the power to establish a minimum limit, below which he shall not produce?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think so. I think our courts were really wrong in the extent to which they said the LaGuardia amendment to the antitrust laws completely exempted unions from all antitrust laws. The Congress did not intend that. But the courts practically ruled that way, and at the present time, the unions can organize and bargain collectively for wages and working conditions—which I think is very proper. I am old enough to remember when the workman really had it tough, when what Teddy Roosevelt used to call the malefactors of great wealth made it difficult for the workers in the coalfields and the mills and other industries. I am glad they are organized. I am glad they have power. But I believe they should use that power with due restraint and consideration of the public interest; and if there should be some arbitrary, reckless, selfish labor leaders, we ought to have some provision under the antitrust laws—they would all be tried in court, now, under the antitrust laws—where, when they have gone beyond the operation of a union to beat this Nation to its knees, restraints could be imposed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. BREWSTER. The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has indicated that perhaps this is not the propitious time to discuss the repeal of 14(b), and that there are other pressing matters that should be considered by the U.S. Senate. I could not agree more that the situation in Vietnam and the President's budget should be taken up in the immediate future. Therefore, would not the senior Senator from Virginia agree that perhaps we should vote "yes" or "no" on the repeal of 14(b) at the earliest possible moment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No; I think it would be much better to say that we do not have time for the Senator from Vir-

ginia to tell everybody how bad this bill is, and rather than take the time for him to do that, and discuss the constitutionality of it, we will drop this effort, or put it at the tail end of the program, and if we can keep a majority here after Labor Day, we will take it up then. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the position of the Senator from Virginia that before we vote, Members of the Senate should be informed about the dangers that reside in the proposal that has been made?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I suppose; and we cannot do that in a few hours every now and then. It will require a considerable period of time, and that is the reason I do not believe we have time to go into this matter fully. I hope that when the snow melts a little next week, and the weather clears up, the leadership will say, "This is an exercise in futility. We cannot get anywhere except to have some more talk. We cannot convince the believers in States' rights that they should lie down and play dead; they will not do it, and so we will drop this bill for the time being."

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM AS GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN SEES IT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I was much struck with Gen. James M. Gavin's letter which appears in the current Harper's magazine and find that he has articulated from a practical, military viewpoint many of the thoughts in my own mind.

I believe it to be an excellent article, and that its full flavor has not been conveyed by the shorter reports of it.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record, together with an editorial published in the Providence Journal of January 26, 1966. As the editorial states in its concluding sentence:

General Gavin's practical questions have yet to be answered adequately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM

(In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts "to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva.")

(General Gavin argues for such a change in policy on purely military grounds. His

views on the Vietnam war cannot be taken lightly, since he has established a reputation during the last 30 years as one of America's leading strategic thinkers. At the time of the French defeat in Vietnam, he was chief of Plans and Operations for the Department of the Army, and his advice is generally believed to be largely responsible for the U.S. refusal to enter the southeast Asian conflict on a large scale at that time. He enlisted in the Army as a private in 1924 and rose to the rank of lieutenant general before his retirement in 1958; he had a distinguished combat career as a paratroop commander in World War II; and he served for a time as chief of Research and Development for the Army. After retirement he was Ambassador to France, and is now chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research firm in Cambridge, Mass.

(He left the Pentagon because of disagreements on what was, in 1958, the basic military policy of the Eisenhower administration. His reasons for such disagreements were set forth in his book, "War and Peace in the Space Age," published by Harper & Row; as he indicates in the following letter, most of the changes he then urged have since been carried out.

(The editors hope that General Gavin's communication may stimulate a searching reexamination of American military and foreign policies by other public figures who are especially qualified by experience and training to discuss them. In the coming months Harper's hopes to publish further contributions to such a reappraisal.—THE EDITORS.)

(By Gen. James M. Gavin)

Last November our Secretary of Defense, while in Vietnam, finally gave battlefield approval to the concept of sky cavalry. Harper's should take some pride in the fact that it published my article, "Cavalry, and I Don't Mean Horses," in 1954. That was the genesis of the idea for this new form of mobility for our ground forces. It was too revolutionary for acceptance in the Pentagon then, and Harper's performed a public service in helping advance the idea.

I would like to comment about the Vietnam situation further. I should emphasize at the outset that I am writing solely from a military-technical point of view. I was Chief of Plans and Operations in the Department of the Army when Dienbienphu brought the French endeavors in Vietnam to an end. The Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta. As I recall, we were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units. We had one or two old China hands on the staff at the time and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical, and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh. If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its warmaking capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all.

I should emphasize at the outset that there are philosophical and moral aspects of the war in southeast Asia that are understandably disturbing to every thoughtful person. My comments, however, are based entirely upon a tactical evaluation of our efforts there. At the time of the French defeat, it seemed to us military planners that if an effort were made by the United States to secure Vietnam from Chinese military exploitation, and that if force on the scale that

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7

Sixty-seven percent of the American people believe that no citizen should be forced to belong to a union in order to hold his job, according to a nationwide survey of public opinion by Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch has said "it would be a tragic day in American history" if the Senate should join the House in voting to repeal 14(b).

The repeal—

The newspaper explained—would remove a critical barrier against infiltration of unions by Communist elements.

In the 19 States which now have laws against compulsory union membership, a workman has a right not to join a union, if, in his opinion, it is infiltrated or dominated by Communists.

The danger of that happening, especially during a depression or recession, was greatly increased when the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a Federal law making it a crime for Communists to hold office in labor unions.

How did the right-to-work movement start? Why was it necessary in this "land of the free?"

The National Right-To-Work Committee, organized in 1955 to protect workers against compulsory unionism, traces the history of the movement as follows:

The right-to-work movement began in the early 1940's as an expression of public disapproval of the compulsory membership power being exercised by labor unions with the sanction of Federal labor law.

This power of unions to force working men and women into unions through contracts containing compulsory membership clauses was a full swing of the pendulum from the old yellow dog contracts at the turn of the century. In those, employers required employees to agree, as a condition of employment, they would not join unions.

The old yellow dog contracts were outlawed in 1932 by the Norris-LaGuardia Act as an unconscionable infringement on the individual liberty of working men and women. At the same time, the Norris-LaGuardia Act clearly stipulated the right of workers not to join unions.

The yellow dog contract returned in reverse in 1935 with the Wagner Act, which authorized closed shop contracts between unions and employers, requiring anyone seeking employment to join the union before he could be hired.

The first right-to-work laws were passed in 1944 in Florida and Arkansas. By public referendum these States amended their constitutions to declare that membership or nonmembership in a labor union should not be made a condition of the opportunity to work or to remain in the employment of an employer.

These, like other similar laws enacted later, restated the rights of workers to form unions and to bargain collectively. That is why I say these laws were not intended to destroy organized labor, but only to preserve individual freedom.

In 1946 Arizona and Nebraska passed right-to-work laws, and before the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted in 1947 five other States had followed suit. These were Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, and Iowa.

Congress debated thoroughly the question of whether right-to-work laws were a proper field of legislative activity for the States before it adopted section 14(b).

Before the end of 1947 two more States, South Dakota and Texas, had passed a right-to-work law. Other States now having right-to-work laws and the years of enactment are: North Dakota, 1948; Nevada, 1952; Alabama, 1953; Mississippi and South Carolina, 1954; Utah, 1955; Kansas, 1958; and Wyoming, 1963.

Action by these 19 States for right-to-work laws represents the will of 50 million citizens of those States.

And the other millions of citizens of the United States now have the right to enact similar legislation if they so desire.

Naturally, the right-to-work laws were tested in the courts by their opponents. The result of these court tests was as follows, according to the National Right-to-Work Committee:

Authority of the States to enact right-to-work laws was fully upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Lincoln Union v. Northwestern* in 1949, and in the *Schermerhorn* decisions on December 2, 1963.

The Supreme Court held that State laws which prohibit both compulsory union membership and the agency shop (in which employees are forced to pay the equivalent of dues to unions, even if not members) are valid and effective.

The Nation's highest tribunal also held that power of enforcement of right-to-work laws rests with State courts. The *Schermerhorn* cases were a complete victory for proponents of voluntary unionism laws over the efforts of opponents to weaken or destroy them through the courts.

Let those who claim that State right-to-work laws are improper challenge them in the forum where they were enacted—the State legislatures.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What happens to the liberties of U.S. citizens when, under the law of this Government, a member of a union can be fined by the union when, as a worker trying to sustain himself in life, he produces more goods at his job than the union declares may be produced?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That strikes a very vital blow at the type of freedom we are supposed to have under the Constitution.

It also transfers cases from what we would be constrained to feel would be a fair and judicial process to a prejudiced private body which would pass sentence and impose a fine upon a member. In this process numerous provisions of our Constitution would be violated, provisions such as the right to a jury trial, the right of indictment, the right to be confronted by one's accuser, and the right to be tried by a jury of one's peers.

At a later time, I shall go quite fully into the question of the general phase of this bill as it affects constitutional rights.

At the moment, I shall merely say that it violates my concept of personal freedom, and it violates a law that Virginia passed in 1947.

I have told my labor friends who want me to vote for this bill, "If you think the law is wrong, the State legislature that passed the law is now in session. The forum that enacted the law is the forum in which you should test it. Ask the State legislature to repeal it, and do not ask me to try to force this proposal upon

people in Virginia, who think they were right in the first instance."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does not the answer of the Senator mean that it is wrong and is a violation of individual freedom for any labor union to tell a worker, "Thus much you may produce, but you cannot go beyond that," even though the worker feels that he has been a laggard and that he has not been contributing within his ability?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree with my friend that no organization should have such power. Labor has pointed in all of its demands for increased pay to increased production. Our money has depreciated relatively little in the past 10 years compared with the currencies of major nations. It has decreased 15 percent. But if one takes 15 percent from a Government bond that has 30 or 40 years to run, it can be very harmful. What has kept our prices more or less stable has been that while we have increased wages a little faster than production, production has gone up.

Production has been going up at a rate of 3.5 or 4 percent a year. That is the reason why the President said:

Let us keep the wage increases down to 3.5 percent a year.

Otherwise they violate the guideline.

An unfortunate trend that we have just discovered in the past year is that we have increased the money supply of this Nation by 8 percent. That creates what the economists call the demand pull in inflation.

We have had what is called creeping inflation. It has been held down. Factories were not running at full capacity. We were not at war. We were not diverting our production to war, to be chewed up in the jungles. The enemy has shot down \$1 billion worth of planes in the past year, and we must replace them.

We had increased production. Wages did not go up very much more than production. We were able to absorb, in the money supply, the money that the Government borrowed.

But now we have almost full production. We have labor going beyond the guidelines of 3½ percent on wages. Then we have a new injection of credit, bank check money and actual cash, going into the money stream.

Twice the rate of increased production—What does that mean? It means more dollars chasing fewer goods, and that is what the economists call the demand pull.

Let us think of our economy as a great warehouse. One man puts in shoes, one man puts in automobiles, and another man puts in something else. We issue tickets. What is a ticket? It is a dollar.

Suppose we had a pair of shoes in there, and it took ten tickets—\$10—to get them, and instead of having those \$10 out, we issue \$20. It takes twice as many tickets to get the same type of shoes, and we must have the shoes.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster]. He is one of the great successful farmers of the Nation. He knows what has happened to hogs. The supply went down, but the people wanted to continue eating bacon. So what happened? Bacon

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1259

we were talking about were to be employed, then the Chinese would very likely reopen the fighting in Korea.

At the time, General Ridgway thought it prudent to bring this situation directly to the attention of President Eisenhower, pointing out that we should be prepared for a large-scale war if we were to make the initial large-scale commitment to the Hanoi Delta that we were thinking about. I thought at the time that it took great moral courage for General Ridgway to take this action, but he has never been a man to lack such courage. The President decided not to make the commitment and in his book, "Mandate for Change," he commented that to have gone to war under those conditions would have been "like hitting the tail of the snake rather than the head," which is a good analogy.

Today we have sufficient force in South Vietnam to hold several enclaves on the coast, where sea and air power can be made fully effective. By enclaves I suggest Camranh Bay, Danang, and similar areas where American bases are being established. However, we are stretching these resources beyond reason in our endeavors to secure the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong penetration. This situation, of course, is caused by the growing Vietcong strength.

The time has come, therefore, when we simply have to make up our mind what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this. In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th parallel to the Mekong River, and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam.

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the South. Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese volunteers and the reopening of the Korean front. This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on.

On the other hand, if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks in North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva, we could very likely do so with the forces now available. Maintaining such enclaves while an effort is being made to solve the internal situation in Vietnam, and in the face of the terroristic war that would be waged against them, poses some serious problems, and the retention of some of the enclaves may prove to be unwise; but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expansion of the conflict.

I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next step would be Waikiki. The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand. But we should be realistic about the dangers of the course that we are now on. A straightforward escalation of our land power in southeast Asia to meet every land-based challenge, while at the same time we leave China and Cambodia immune from attack poses some very forbidding prospects. I realize that our Secretary of State was recently quoted in the press as having said that "the idea of sanctuary is out." However, the initiative is not ours and there is an abun-

dance of evidence now that both China and Cambodia are sanctuaries for Communist military strength that is used to support the Vietcong.

To get to the heart of the problem, I doubt that world opinion would tolerate the bombing and seizure of Manchuria. If the Chinese Communists continue on their present course of aggression and, at the same time, continue to develop more devastating weapons—and I refer to nuclear weapons—the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet. In the meantime, we must do the best we can with the forces we have deployed to Vietnam, keeping in mind the true meaning of strategy in global affairs. Economics, science and technology, and world opinion will, in the long run, serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly. Since the advent of the space age, there has been a revolution in the nature of war and global conflict. The confrontation in Vietnam is the first test of our understanding of such change, or our lack of it. The measures that we now take in southeast Asia must stem from sagacity and thoughtfulness, and an awareness of the nature of strategy in this rapidly shrinking world.

Referring again to the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, it is the kind of innovation that is generally unpopular in a conservative society and in the military establishment of such a society. But many more innovations, both technical and in management methods, must be found if we are to continue to survive as a free people. Merely making bigger bombs or using more of them is not the answer. So I hope that Harper's will continue to support innovative methods when they are suggested, as you did when you first published the idea of sky cavalry in 1954.

When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an Army that I wanted it to be. I think it is that kind of an Army now, and I would be happy to serve in it in any grade in Vietnam or anywhere else. It is doing a splendid job in Vietnam and needs the support of all of our people.

[From the Providence Journal, Jan. 26, 1966]

A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON THE VIETNAM WAR

A dispute between military men has put the question of war and peace in Vietnam into a practical new perspective.

Too many Americans regard the Vietnam controversy as simply a debate between pacifists—those who would seek peace at almost any price in almost any place—and those who believe the United States must be prepared to use force to stop communism wherever necessary. When the issue is put in this light, obviously most Americans, who are by-and-large not pacifists, must support the use of whatever force experts deem necessary to protect American vital interests. But the question of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam is not that simple.

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin (retired), a brilliant combat commander in World War II and Korea and former Army chief of planning, has raised pertinent questions about administration Vietnam policy, not on pacifist grounds, but on the basis of a hard headed assessment of military realities. In a letter to Harper's magazine, General Gavin made these points:

1. He disputed the "domino theory" of those who argue that a defeat in Vietnam would lead to an eventual fallback to Hawaii.

2. He argued that to resume and broaden the bombing of North Vietnam would add to our problems and would not stop the infiltration of troops from the north.

3. He warned that a large buildup of American troops in South Vietnam would invite the intervention of Chinese volunteers and reopening of Korean hostilities.

4. He recommended that the United States pull back to enclaves on the coast, which could be held by forces already available in Vietnam, while we seek a long-term solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva.

It should be noted that General Gavin made a thorough study of the advisability of introducing American forces into Vietnam in 1954 when the French effort to reestablish colonial rule there was collapsing. General Gavin's negative report was accepted by President Eisenhower. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who was Chief of Staff of the Army in 1954, also opposed intervention at that time and has endorsed General Gavin's renewed opposition to U.S. participation in this war on the Asian land mass.

The Gavin thesis has been challenged, however, as might be expected, by the current chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler. General Wheeler's rebuttal before a Senate committee last Thursday is not impressive, at least not as it has been reported so far. He argued:

1. That bombing of the north is a "blue chip" in bargaining that we cannot afford to abandon.

This begs the question. General Gavin did not argue that bombing has no advantage but rather that it has more disadvantages—as, for example, the danger of bringing the Chinese or the Russians, or both, into the war.

2. That the proposal to hold only easily defended enclaves with American forces had been considered and abandoned.

Why was it abandoned? What has been the result of the alternative policy of sending American troops on offensive operations deep into Vietnamese territory? Many American lives have been lost, but no substantial territorial gains have been registered. What are the practical chances of success of an American clear-and-hold operation in an alien and unfriendly land? What would be the cost and how long would American troops have to stay? What would we have of worth if we won?

3. That the United States is not in Vietnam for colonial purposes like the French but merely to help the South Vietnamese protect their freedom.

It has become increasingly clear that U.S. forces have effectively taken over the war from the allies they are supposed to be supporting. Why is it that when U.S. troops launched their recent offensive into the Iron Triangle northwest of Saigon they didn't even advise the South Vietnamese of their plans until the last minute? Does it make sense to continue to help those who can't or won't help themselves; to send American troops into battle beside allies who can't be trusted to keep military secrets, let alone to stand and fight in a crisis?

4. That if we lose the war in Vietnam "we will have more wars of national liberation to face up to with the prospect of greater losses under less favorable conditions."

Could there be less favorable conditions than to take on a national liberation movement that has been seasoned in long years of battle against a colonial power whose place we have, in effect, taken; to fight 8,000 miles from home in a country that is contiguous to a rival great power and in a jungle war where our armor is at a disadvantage and where we can be indefinitely outnumbered; to fight in support of a corrupt, discredited regime against a Communist leader who happens also to be a national hero?

All peaceniks aside, does the Vietnamese war as it has been waged and as it may be

waged again make any sense as a sound military venture for the United States? General Gavin's practical questions have yet to be answered adequately.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY TO AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, JANUARY 20, 1966

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on January 20, 1966, I had the good fortune to dine with the American Council of Learned Societies and to hear the lucid, articulate, and well-thought-out speech of Vice President HUMPHREY. As always, the Vice President's words showed a remarkable depth of thought and breadth of knowledge. I particularly liked his emphasis on the importance of the generalist and of the value of the humanities in our national life.

Moreover, the Vice President is preeminently qualified to give such a speech as he is, himself, such an outstanding and distinguished example of the generalist or humanist—in sum, the universal man.

Because of the excellence of Vice President HUMPHREY's speech, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 20, 1966

It is good to be with you tonight and to join with you in celebrating the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. I have long valued and admired the work of your council and of its constituent organizations. To one of them, I owe a special obligation.

Some years ago, I received a thorough in-service training in the art of being a vice president—vice president of the American Political Science Association, that is. My good friend, Evron Kirkpatrick and his associates took me in charge, and shepherded me through my tenure in office. In fact, they even pronounced me fit for further service. How could I say no when the next offer of a vice presidency came my way?

For many years, men in public life have professed their love of the arts and humanities—and their profound regret that they could do nothing tangible to help them. But, thanks in large part to your stanch friends in the Congress, things have changed.

I know that Senator PELL, Senators JAVIS, CLARK, and GRUENING, Congressmen THOMPSON, FOGARTY, MOORHEAD, and WIDNALL, and many others share my pride tonight that the Congress has provided financial support for the arts and humanities.

In 1964 we did achieve a significant first step: the creation of the National Council on the Arts. But the establishment of a foundation, endowed with real money, still seemed remote then.

We had enthusiasm. But we didn't have the votes. Then came the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Thanks to determined leadership by President Johnson and skilled floor work by your friends in Congress, we did break through.

As you undoubtedly recall, the debates in Congress focused largely on the arts rather than the humanities. There were a variety of reasons for this. Nearly everyone considers himself a qualified critic of the arts—in the sense that, like Mr. Khrushchev, he knows what he likes and doesn't hesitate to say so.

Moreover, by their very nature, the performing arts are public in character and presuppose the existence of an audience. Their practitioners are public figures, and possess that quality we call glamour. But the practitioners of the humanities are, for the most part, free of the more dubious blessings of public attention.

Few laymen profess with confidence to know what they like in philosophy or linguistics—and fewer still to say so. Editorial writers, columnists, and commentators of all sorts are not constantly looking over your shoulders and advising you what to do and what not to do, what to say and what to leave unsaid—unless, of course, you write history about the living as well as the dead.

But even privacy can be pushed too far. As men and women who have dedicated your lives to the service of knowledge, you have every right to expect a reasonable degree of public understanding and recognition.

And, to look for a moment at the other side of the coin, now that the humanities have formally entered the competition for public funds, you have a certain responsibility to make clear to the public—and to your representatives here in Washington—some appreciation of what you do and why it is important.

The eloquent report of your Commission on the Humanities was a welcome step in this direction. And it is no exaggeration to say that this report won for the humanities an equal place in the new National Foundation. But the process of communication with the public and the Congress must be a continuing one. You can never assume that the case has been made once and for all.

Perhaps I, as an amateur humanist and a professional public servant, can be of some help here by telling you what I consider the vital contribution of the humanities to our national life.

First of all, a thorough grounding in the humanities sharpens, in the individual, the quality of choice. Choice is a vital part of all our lives, and nowhere is it more important than in government; indeed, a wise Frenchman has observed that "to govern is to choose." Each choice taken—indeed, even each choice deferred or avoided—has consequences reaching far into the future.

There is an abundance of specialists who can provide us with the facts relevant to decisions—the "what," the "where," the "when," and the "how." But when they have laid their facts upon the table, an essential factor is still missing: the "why." No narrow specialty or expertise can provide the full and essential grasp of the continuity of past, present, and future than the humanities do.

Let me make it clear: I do not believe that the humanities must be justified on the grounds of any immediate and practical consequences. In the most fundamental sense, they are good in themselves simply because they are the bearers and preservers of what we call civilization.

The historian who brings order out of the tangled record of the past, the critic who casts new light on a work of literature or painting or music, the philosopher who questions and clarifies our most basic assumptions—all of these serve to enrich our lives and to expand our vision. Together they constitute one of our most precious national resources.

One of the most important facts about the establishment of the new humanities endowment is that it does at last constitute a recognition of the humanities for their own sake. Humanist scholars, as you are well aware, have long received support from the Federal Government. But in the past this support was always justified in terms of something else: international cooperation, the improvement of the school curriculum, national defense, and so forth.

Now the President and Congress have gone on record as believing that the strengthening of the humanities as such is in the public interest. The National Government has, in effect, endorsed the words of your Commission on the Humanities: "Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit."

Ultimately, the fate of the humanities must rest in the hands of devoted individuals: scholars who pursue their researches wherever they may lead—guided by their own intelligence and by the canons of scholarship itself. These individuals, in their singleminded dedication to their calling, may often be deaf to the cries of the marketplace and the forum—to the seductive voices of fashion and of expediency.

Certainly the American Council of Learned Societies may be proud of its long record of supporting worthy scholars despite the apparent lack of popular interest in what those scholars proposed to do. By maintaining and applying the most rigorous intellectual standards, often in defiance of fashion and of popular "trends," the ACLS has served the humanities and the Nation as well. But the history of the ACLS illustrates another principle I think is well worth mentioning on this occasion.

In every field of intellectual endeavor, in the sciences as well as the humanities, what today appears to be the most esoteric and impractical research may tomorrow prove to be of the utmost practical usefulness and importance. I stress "may" because I do not think that the case for basic research and scholarship in the humanities should be made to rest on claims of practical utility.

In this connection I think, for example, of your council's continuing interest in the study and understanding of languages. For many years, yours was the only organization in this country to offer encouragement and support for scholarly work in what were then rather patronizingly termed "exotic" languages. Suddenly, with our involvement in World War II, we found ourselves in urgent need of communication with peoples who spoke some of these languages.

Besides linguists, we also needed scholars whose knowledge of the basic structure of language enabled them to develop new and more effective techniques of language instruction for the Armed Forces.

The same story can be told of the development in this country of area studies, in which your Council has also played a leading role. Our possession of substantial numbers of highly trained and skilled experts on the peoples and cultures of Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Latin America, and Africa has turned out to be an invaluable national asset. The United States would simply not be able to discharge its worldwide responsibility adequately without them.

In both these cases, and others I could cite, the so-called impractical scholars turned out to be more farsighted than many of our public officials.

But this is neither surprising nor distressing. It is, in fact, as it should be. The scholar—by disposition, by training, and by situation—is peculiarly fitted to take the long, detached view of men and of societies. To do so is both his privilege and his responsibility. Whatever the pleasures of public life may be—and I assure you there are many—the opportunity for contemplation is seldom among them.

I am a man in public life and a man of affairs. As such, I envy your opportunity to ponder in depth and at length all the ramifications of human knowledge and experience. And I do hope that the program of the humanities endowment will include some opportunity for scholars to impart more di-

District of New Jersey there are many senior citizens who have availed themselves of the services of licensed chiropractors. I am sure that other Members have received much mail urging us to include chiropractors in the medicare section of the social security amendments. The free choice in the selection of health care is as paramount as the right to have adequate health care. The law assures the right to adequate care but denies the right of choice. In a free society this should not prevail and I trust you will safeguard this right.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PARCEL POST SYSTEM

(Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House; today I have introduced legislation to provide long-needed improvements in the Nation's parcel post system and to place the service on a sound financial basis.

This bill which I have introduced contains these major provisions:

It removes a service discrimination against 70 percent of our people served by the first-class post offices who cannot mail a parcel of more than 20 pounds to another first-class post office if it is more than 150 miles away.

The weight limit becomes 40 pounds, the same as now permitted for parcels going less than 150 miles, thus providing much greater flexibility and better service for business and individual mailers.

It provides a uniform size limit for all parcels of 100 inches in length and girth combined, corresponding to present size limits of parcels mailed to or from smaller second-, third-, and fourth-class offices.

The changes in the size and weight limits because of operating efficiency and increased volume will reduce parcel post deficits by \$40 million annually.

An additional \$62 million annually will be provided by rate adjustments. ZIP code and handling economies bring the total to \$107 million.

Last year, our subcommittee held extensive hearings on legislation on parcel post.

During those hearings, the Post Office Department said it would be prepared to submit recommendations early this year. It appears to me that this new legislation now meets the objections raised.

This legislation which I am introducing today, for example, meets objections of those who were against removal of the ratemaking authority vested in the Postmaster General and subject to ICC approval. This bill retains that authority.

This legislation would not change any of the beneficial provisions of the parcel post service already in effect for farmers and other mailers receiving goods mailed at large first-class post offices, or sending parcels to such offices from the smaller second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices.

In fact, those mailing to and from second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices would have been paying less for their parcel mailings if the Postal Service had in the past not missed out on a lot of revenue because of the size and weight limitations. It is estimated that these restrictions have cost mailers or taxpayers more than \$500 million over the last 14 years in higher rates.

I intend to call hearings on this legislation at the earliest possible date, and I am hopeful of speedy action on this measure in this session.

The Postmaster General has advised the Congress of the urgency of firming up rate adjustments and the realistic public service changes needed in size and weight limits, as well as the importance of other features of this legislation as soon as possible.

The \$40 million yield annually in size and weight revisions, it should be noted, will result from anticipated increases in parcel post volume, as well as increased efficiency in the handling of parcels that the revisions will make possible.

The need to provide better service to the public is another paramount consideration.

The present limitations have not made sense for a long time.

One of my constituents in Baton Rouge cannot mail a parcel at any time even to relatives in Dallas, or Austin, or San Antonio, or Little Rock, if it weighs more than 20 pounds. Sometimes they want the privilege of sending a parcel over 20 pounds. They have to split the thing up into two or maybe three parcels, with all that trouble.

Seventy percent of our people all over the country are served by these first-class post offices. Usually they want to mail parcels to persons living in other first-class post offices. And I see no reason in the world why my constituents in our first-class post office at Baton Rouge or Hammond should be subject to this—nor is there any reason why it should apply to the constituents that the Members of this House represent.

I do not believe that there has been a full understanding of this unreasonable restriction. If so, I am surprised that we have put up with it. For this reason, largely, and many other good reasons, I feel we should take prompt action on this bill.

LET'S BE FAIR WITH OUR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES THIS YEAR

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, again last year as this Congress was hurrying toward adjournment we failed to fulfill our commitment to our Federal employees that their salaries should be as comparable as possible to the salaries paid to employees in private industry for similar types and levels of work. In the closing hours of the last session the House receded from the position it had earlier taken in passing a reasonably decent pay raise bill for Federal employees.

We accepted the watered-down version as handed to us by the other body, and again our dedicated Federal employees found themselves short changed at the comparability counter.

The only encouragement that was given to them were the numerous promises and commitments spoken in this House, in the other body, and at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that next year things would be different, and that early action would be taken on legislation that would provide proper salary increases and adjustments in fringe benefits to bring our employees up to comparability.

Now is the time when we here must honor both our commitments of last year and the legislative commitment of full comparability that we enacted in 1962.

I have introduced a bill now pending before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee (H.R. 12240) that is designed to fulfill both these commitments. In brief, it provides for a 7-percent increase in the salaries of all postal and Federal employees effective July 1, 1966. Additionally, my bill will further liberalize the present overtime provisions of law affecting our one-half million postal employees. While the overtime provisions in my bill are not in some ways as liberal as those which this House did enact last year, they are a vast improvement over the watered-down provisions we were forced to accept from the other body and they will put postal employees in a more comparable overtime position with private industry employees.

Mr. Speaker, I simply do not believe that this Congress intends that our Federal employees should be in a position of helping to finance our tremendous defense effort and all other Federal spending programs by being required to work for wages below those paid by private employers. I repeat that we have a deep and a binding commitment to these people. We must discharge it as promptly as possible.

I intend to work for prompt action on my bill, H.R. 12240, and I sincerely welcome the support of my colleagues.

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter in the Record.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned by reports that the administration is about to resume the bombings of North Vietnam because of the lack of a positive response from Hanoi to the President's efforts to induce negotiations.

I strongly support the determined efforts the President has made to seek out other than military solutions to the painful war in Vietnam. I believe we ought to persevere in this effort and to employ every means at our command to create a climate favorable for bringing the Vietnam war to a peaceful and just settlement at the conference table.

I am unconvinced at this time that by resuming bombings such a climate for negotiations will be produced. Rather,

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1281

any study or investigation to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR FURTHER EXPENSES FOR STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 44, BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 663, providing for further expenses for studies and investigations pursuant to House Resolution 44, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 663

Resolved. That, effective January 10, 1966, the further expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 44 by the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000 including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 11, add:

"Sec. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 80, BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 667, to provide additional funds for the expenses

of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 80, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 667

Resolved. That the further expenses of investigations and studies to be made pursuant to H. Res. 80 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$75,000, including expenditures for the employment of professional, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 151, BY THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I send to the desk a privileged report on House Resolution 686, to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 151, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 686

Resolved. That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 151 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, not to exceed \$85,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such studies and investigations, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investi-

gated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE SERVICES OF CHIROPRACTORS UNDER THE VOLUNTARY SECTION OF MEDICARE

(Mr. DANIELS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would include the services of chiropractors under the voluntary section of medicare. As you are aware, the medicare bill became law with the exclusion of this health profession. Since its passage, the significance of this situation has become ever more apparent. It has come to my attention time and again that elder citizens who pay the additional premium under this section, wish the right to choose the health care they receive.

It seems a reasonable choice especially in view of the fact that chiropractors are examined and licensed in the various States.

The Senate included chiropractic services in the voluntary section of the bill last year by a strong vote. This would avail those elder citizens, who found chiropractic care helpful and beneficial, of the right to have their choice of health care covered under medicare.

The services of chiropractors were deleted from the final bill in the joint conference deliberations. As it now stands, the chiropractic profession is the only major healing art to be excluded from the act.

I respectfully submit the voluntary feature of the bill should include chiropractic health services as a matter of the choice of the patient. If there be a stipulation in this instance, it should be that the practitioner has been examined and duly licensed in that State in which he practices. Please bear in mind that in this section the patient says part of the cost from his own funds.

We have countless requests from aged persons asking why is this health care, which they find so helpful, being denied them? The costs of assistance by the use of chiropractic care is comparatively less than medical treatment. When in the judgment of the practitioner, chiropractic treatment can be beneficial to the patient, the results have been excellent.

The number of chiropractic patients in this country is over a million. These are people who have found chiropractic to benefit their health, often when medical care has been unsuccessful. The elder of these patients paying social security for the greater part of their lives must not be denied the right to choose health care, licensed in their State, which they have found of assistance in maintaining good health. I know that in the 14th

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1283

I believe we ought to continue the peace offensive.

As Gen. James M. Gavin has argued so forcefully, resuming the bombings will add to our problems not detract from them. I commend to my colleagues, General Gavin's assessment of our military posture in Vietnam as set forth in a letter written by him and published in the February issue of Harper's magazine. Following is the text of General Gavin's communication:

[From Harper's magazine, February 1966]
A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

(NOTE.—In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts "to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva.")

(General Gavin argues for such a change in policy on purely military grounds. His views on the Vietnam war cannot be taken lightly, since he has established a reputation during the last 30 years as one of America's leading strategic thinkers. At the time of the French defeat in Vietnam he was Chief of Plans and Operations for the Department of the Army, and his advice is generally believed to be largely responsible for the U.S. refusal to enter the southeast Asian conflict on a large scale at that time. He enlisted in the Army as a private in 1924 and rose to the rank of lieutenant general before his retirement in 1958; he had a distinguished combat career as a paratroop commander in World War II; and he served for a time as Chief of Research and Development for the Army. After retirement he was Ambassador to France, and is now chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research firm in Cambridge, Mass.)

(He left the Pentagon because of disagreement on what was, in 1958, the basic military policy of the Eisenhower administration. His reasons for such disagreements were set forth in his book, "War and Peace in the Space Age," published by Harper & Row; as he indicates in the following letter, most of the changes he then urged have since been carried out.)

(The editors hope that General Gavin's communication may stimulate a searching reexamination of American military and foreign policies by other public figures who are especially qualified by experience and training to discuss them. In the coming months Harper's hopes to publish further contributions to such a reappraisal.—THE EDITORS.)

Last November our Secretary of Defense, while in Vietnam, finally gave battlefield approval to the concept of sky cavalry. Harper's should take some pride in the fact that it published my article, "Cavalry, and I Don't Mean Horses," in 1954. That was the genesis of the idea for this new form of mobility for our ground forces. It was too revolutionary for acceptance in the Pentagon then, and Harper's performed a public service in helping advance the idea.

I would like to comment about the Vietnam situation further. I should emphasize at the outset that I am writing solely from a military-technical point of view. I was Chief of Plans and Operations in the Department of the Army when Dienbienphu brought the French endeavors in Vietnam to an end. The Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a de-

cision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta. As I recall, we were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units. We had one or two old China hands on the staff at the time and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh. If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its war-making capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all.

I should emphasize at the outset that there are philosophical and moral aspects of the war in southeast Asia that are understandably disturbing to every thoughtful person. My comments, however, are based entirely upon a tactical evaluation of our efforts there. At the time of the French defeat, it seemed to us military planners that if an effort were made by the United States to secure Vietnam from Chinese military exploitation, and that if force on the scale that we were talking about were to be employed, then the Chinese would very likely reopen the fighting in Korea.

At the time, General Ridgway thought it prudent to bring this situation directly to the attention of President Eisenhower, pointing out that we should be prepared for a large-scale war if we were to make the initial large-scale commitment to the Hanoi Delta that we were thinking about. I thought at the time that it took great moral courage for General Ridgway to take this action, but he has never been a man to lack such courage. The President decided not to make the commitment and in his book "Mandate for Change," he commented that to have gone to war under those conditions would have been "like hitting the tail of the snake rather than the head," which is a good analogy.

Today we have sufficient force in South Vietnam to hold several enclaves on the coast, where sea and air power can be made fully effective. By enclaves I suggest Camranh Bay, Danang, and similar areas where American bases are being established. However, we are stretching these resources beyond reason in our endeavors to secure the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong penetration. This situation, of course, is caused by the growing Vietcong strength.

The time has come, therefore, when we simply have to make up our mind what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this. In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th parallel to the Mekong River, and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam.

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the south. Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese volunteers and the reopening of the Korean front. This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on.

On the other hand, if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks in North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva, we could very likely do

so with the forces now available. Maintaining such enclaves while an effort is being made to solve the internal situation in Vietnam, and in the face of the terroristic war that would be waged against them, poses some serious problems, and the retention of some of the enclaves may prove to be unwise; but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expansion of the conflict.

I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki. The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand. But we should be realistic about the dangers of the course that we are now on. A straightforward escalation of our land power in southeast Asia to meet every land-based challenge, while at the same time we leave China and Cambodia immune from attack, poses some very forbidding prospects. I realize that our Secretary of State was recently quoted in the press as having said that "the idea of sanctuary is out." However, the initiative is not ours and there is an abundance of evidence now that both China and Cambodia are sanctuaries for Communist military strength that is used to support the Vietcong.

To get to the heart of the problem, I doubt that world opinion would tolerate the bombing and seizure of Manchuria. If the Chinese Communists continue on their present course of aggression and, at the same time, continue to develop more devastating weapons—and I refer to nuclear weapons—the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet. In the meantime, we must do the best we can with the forces we have deployed to Vietnam, keeping in mind the true meaning of strategy in global affairs. Economics, science and technology, and world opinion will, in the long run, serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly. Since the advent of the space age, there has been a revolution in the nature of war and global conflict. The confrontation in Vietnam is the first test of our understanding of such change, or our lack of it. The measures that we now take in southeast Asia must stem from sagacity and thoughtfulness, and an awareness of the nature of strategy in this rapidly shrinking world.

Referring again to the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, it is the kind of innovation that is generally unpopular in a conservative society, and in the military establishment of such a society. But many more innovations, both technical and in management methods, must be found if we are to continue to survive as a free people. Merely making bigger bombs or using more of them is not the answer. So I hope that Harper's will continue to support innovative methods when they are suggested, as you did when you first published the idea of sky cavalry in 1954.

When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an army that I wanted it to be. I think it is that kind of an Army now, and I would be happy to serve in it in any grade in Vietnam or anywhere else. It is doing a splendid job in Vietnam and needs the support of all our people.

JAMES M. GAVIN.

THE TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held hearings on legislation to permit transportation of mail by common carrier motor vehicle. The hearings were in connection with H.R. 6472, a bill which I introduced on March 18, 1965. The purpose of that legislation was to allow the Post Office Department to ship mail between cities by truck on the same basis it now ships mail by train and plane.

During the course of last year's hearings, everyone concerned with the transportation of mail was given an opportunity to be heard. The hearings on H.R. 6472 cleared the air and, I believe, were very helpful. They demonstrated to me the urgent need for new legislation and paved the way for the introduction of a more practical legislative vehicle which I am introducing today. This legislative proposal would give the Postmaster General the authority to use regulated motor carriers on exactly the same basis as he now uses railroad service.

The purpose of my bill is to provide a means by which the Post Office Department can improve its lagging transportation services and of equal urgency to end a particularly onerous discrimination in the transportation of mail.

Motor carriers have been regulated by the Federal Government for over 30 years. In that 30-year time span, they have grown to be a vital and important part of our transportation system. The value of their service to private shippers in carrying a wide range of goods and commodities is an accepted fact of life. There can be no legitimate question raised as to their capability to handle the mail. It seems somewhat absurd that the Post Office Department is the only major entity using transportation services in the United States which cannot use regulated motor carriers in the manner which they are best suited to serve the needs of that Department.

The Post Office Department is seeking greater flexibility in the transportation of mail in order to improve its service to the people of the United States. It seems to me that legislation of the kind I am introducing, would be an important element in their being able to achieve the widest latitude of flexibility. As a matter of fact, the representative of the Post Office Department closed his testimony last year with this kind of statement:

I would like to emphasize the fact that it has been the position of the Department that a change in the law which would increase the flexibility of our management to cope with the complex matters we face today is what we would favor.

I should like to emphasize that the proposal put forth today would not require the Post Office Department to use any particular form of transportation. It would not favor one mode of transportation over another as has been the case for so many years. What it would do is to widen the Department's choice of available transportation service and, in so doing, would also wipe out the long-

standing bar to the use of regulated motor carrier service—a service which the Post Office Department needs if it is to achieve its objective of better postal service for the American people.

IMPACT SCHOOL AID IN PERIL AGAIN

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, America's impact school aid program, authorized under Public Law 874, is in peril once again.

This program, as my colleagues know, provides supplementary funds for public schools in communities having Government installations with large numbers of Federal workers or military personnel. Because these installations and people contribute relatively little to local tax revenues, their presence imposes a special burden on local school districts. For nearly two decades, Public Law 874 has eased this burden, in many cases enabling heavily impacted school districts to remain solvent.

Despite the logic and fairness of this system, the periodic renewal of Public Law 874 has often encountered tough sledding in the executive branch and in Congress. During the 88th Congress, it will be recalled, many local school boards skirted bankruptcy before being saved by a 2-year extension of the program.

Like the beleaguered heroine of silent film serials, our impacted school districts are again being pushed to the edge of the cliff. I am informed that the Office of Education estimates a need for \$416 million to maintain present levels of assistance during fiscal 1967. Against this estimate, the Budget Bureau proposes to allocate exactly \$183 million.

I predict that at least half the Members will be hearing about this as frantic school superintendents begin to realize the impending crisis. Part of our problem stems from a recent change in criteria for eligibility which has qualified roughly a dozen more large cities to participate in impact aid. This occurs because the new standard qualifies school districts having 3 percent of its children from Government families, a sharp drop from the earlier requirement of 6 percent.

Yet in some highly concentrated defense areas, of which my San Diego County district is one, the impact may be nearer 20 percent. Obviously, if Public Law 874 aid is reduced by more than half, the result can only be catastrophic. School boards will be compelled to shorten their academic year—as indeed some were preparing to do late in 1964, when the impact funding was last in doubt. Curtailed building plans or faculty reductions could mean double sessions. Many boards would be forced to cut teacher pay—this, at a time we seek to make the teaching profession more attractive.

Clearly, this must not be allowed to happen. Yet if we let the Budget Bureau set our levels of assistance—if the

Bureau's present plans are implemented—it is exactly what will happen.

We shall doubtless hear it said that Vietnam war expenditures impel budget reductions all down the line. In viewing today's opulent society, I say we are not yet reduced to paying for this war out of the schoolrooms of America—especially the schoolrooms serving those very communities with the most families engaged in defense-related activity.

To the Budget Bureau I say, look elsewhere with your computers and sharp pencils. Do not cheat children.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, authorization has been sought in the Senate to investigate the impact of the Central Intelligence Agency on U.S. foreign policy. In addition, a proposal has been introduced in the Senate to establish a joint Senate-House committee on a permanent basis to oversee CIA operations.

In line with these recent proposals, I want to call to your attention that in 1952, I first saw the need to establish a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities; as a result, in 1953 I authorized the initial legislation proposing the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters.

I sought the advice of the late Senator McMahon, of Connecticut, who so ably worked toward the establishment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Senator McMahon's words of advice along with much able legal assistance, aided me in writing House Concurrent Resolution 168, which I introduced on July 20, 1953. I continued to press for the adoption of this resolution in each succeeding Congress. The history surrounding this joint resolution is well established in congressional archives. It was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 29 in the 84th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 85th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 86th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 87th Congress; and House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 88th Congress.

Since the time of my introduction of this legislation, hundreds of Congressmen and Senators have adopted the resolution as their own. However, regretably, a Congress has yet to act upon it. As a result, it is evident to me that there has been a lack of information on many critical issues until it has been too late. By way of example, lack of information has contributed importantly to the tragic incidences of the Hungarian revolution and the fall of the Diem regime.

I believe very strongly that the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters is long overdue. Had this joint committee been established in the past, many of the problems involving U.S. intelligence would not be in the forefront of world news today.

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A383

in Texas and served as chairman of the first Inter-American Partners Conference.

"I have high hopes for the partners program because of people like you," Vaughn declared, emphasizing the volunteer aspect of Marcus' service. "If I have had a certain amount of preoccupation with the partners program it's because I understand what volunteer operations require in spirit and service and what they accomplish."

Vaughn's appointment to direct the Peace Corps was announced by the White House last week.

In an interview, Marcus told how the Alliance partnership is working for Texas and Peru.

The Texas Hospital Association is making an inventory of surplus equipment; a Peruvian hospital will check what it needs on the inventory and the equipment will be delivered without cost. Also, Marcus said, four Texas doctors will spend their vacations working in a Peruvian charity hospital.

There may be significant developments in the next few months in the program of encouraging Americans to go into business in Peru. Marcus expects construction projects and a textile mill to be among projects that will reinforce their economy.

The time he spends in Latin America is having a secondary effect on Neilman-Marcus, its vice president said. He explained that his and other U.S. stores become aware of beautiful Latin American products.

Marcus summed the project up by stating, "The money being spent is not large and it isn't nearly so important as the number of people involved."

"We are for the partnership idea because it's hard to get mad at somebody you're making money with."

Why Peace Plans Not Working in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial which appeared in the Peoria Journal Star on January 25:

WHY PEACE PLANS NOT WORKING IN VIETNAM

Well, we've had our Christmas truce and our Lunar New Year's truce, and have held back our bombers from North Vietnam for weeks. We have scattered high-ranking officials around the world in a peace offensive, and we've had a new outbreak of senatorial silliness and "peace" pitches.

And what has been physically accomplished?

The Vietcong murdered a flock of civilian refugees, assassinated a couple of village chiefs, and made numerous attacks on United States and Korean forces, notably in South Vietnam.

In North Vietnam, they energetically moved in more missiles and antiaircraft guns taking full advantage of the opportunity we graciously gave them. Meanwhile British and other international vessels, plus Communist vessels, continue to unload the materials for killing American troops at Haiphong and in the upper Mekong.

Between North and South Vietnam, free from aerial attack, new heavier weapons, and new fighting forces moved down to where they can kill Americans and shoot down our helicopters and aircraft more readily.

Our troops, under order, stood by, guns silent, while these preparations went forward. Our pilots held fire while watching the means for their own destruction being erected.

This is the painful reality.

Meanwhile, we did not lose any planes or pilots over North Vietnam for a while, it's true. By keeping them home and using mostly photo drones, we kept the planes intact and the pilots alive.

We had lost almost 200 planes so far attacking second-rate targets there—operating under wraps. But if and as they go back, it is apt to be a lot tougher than before. The sites for missiles and guns that were smashed have had time and freedom to rebuild, and new ones have been added.

Instead of keeping the numbers down by smashing those under construction and thus maintaining the costly gains of putting them out of action in the first place, we now have that whole job to do over again if we are to resume action in the North.

Such is the peace victory we have won. Such is what has been accomplished by the miracle men who saw peace as attainable if we would just seek it and show our good intentions.

Now, as evidence of their good intentions, the Vietcong threatens to murder American prisoners of war, while urging new and harder blows against us—as they have been doing all through the peace talk and truce.

The Vietcong has said there is no peace this side of total surrender and the complete abandonment of South Vietnam into their hands by the U.S. forces. The North Vietnam Government has said over and over, again and again, and is still saying there is no peace this side of total surrender and complete abandonment of that part of the world by U.S. forces.

Red China has said and is saying, over and over, that there is no peace this side of U.S. surrender and abandonment of the people of southeast Asia.

Even "friendly" Russia has repeatedly said and is saying, there is no peace this side of U.S. surrender and abandonment of southeast Asia.

We have advised them all and every neutral government in between and every other capital in the world that we would negotiate unconditionally. The Communist countries have all replied, over and over, "No; surrender first. Get out first."

We have advised them all that we would stop our bombing and remove our troops if they would stop sending troops and guns south from North Vietnam. They have spit on us.

These are the unpleasant facts, and why and how do people manage to cheerfully pretend they do not exist, and to read what they wish "between the lines" of messages written in hate and print and blood so plainly and so often and so categorically?

It is painfully clear that any time the Communists are willing to deal and really want to negotiate, or enjoy a truce, or whatever—they have only to hold up one finger and we will come running and panting to seize the opportunity.

But no finger is raised.

What then is all this pompous gibberish about "new steps" on our part to seek a meeting ground and a peaceful solution? What world are these folks living in? Certainly, not this one.

How in Heaven's name could Senator HENRY JACKSON stand up this past weekend and soberly propose as his great new idea to end the Vietnamese war that we simply make a deal to stop bombing the north in exchange for their stopping the sending of troops, etc., south?

Where has he been all these months? What does he think the situation is? What world is he living in?

We have just offered them much more than that for the same thing and it has accomplished what? Insults and new attacks.

This is shocking, irresponsible incompetence in the U.S. Senate, to so blandly ignore the facts of the situation as they already exist.

It would be more responsible to propose that we tear up our pledges, surrender the Vietnamese people up to slaughter and slavery, and abandon the policy of containing communism. We might as well notify India to quit resisting Red China; the Philippines and Thailand to forget their ties with us and make whatever accommodations they can with the Reds; Japan to forget any promises or pledges and completely review their attitudes toward Red expansion and cooperation; the Germans that our promises regarding Berlin are kaput, and they are on their own; the NATO countries, that our promises to Europe are just as good as our promises to South Vietnam—i.e., worthless; and tell Latin America to read the future without counting on us.

If it isn't worth it; let's face it, and let fall the burdens of world power, and toss our role in the ash can, and our system and power and freedom—and standard of living and former moral concepts, too.

Then, we can make our own accommodation to a world dominated by Communist economics and Communist social system (if they will let us), and see how we like it.

There are three alternatives: (1) we can violently resist; (2) we can systematically surrender; or (3) we can resist until they accept a "live and let live" coexistence.

The other "choices" offered seem to us to be imaginary, emotional, or subversive. They either imagine, against all the evidence, that the Communists are willing to make peace—or else they must argue that we can surrender South Vietnam but resist in other "better" places and still "hold the line."

But the whole argument and attitude of "buying peace" in Vietnam applies anywhere and everywhere * * * and once you start paying a blackmailer, he never stops. It is as true in the history of nations as in criminal history.

Do we resist as best we can? Do we pay the price? Is it worth it, terrible as it is? Or do we give up? Do we pay that price of peace? And is it worth it? That's the question, and we ought to quit fuzzing it up with phoney plans that have already been rejected by the Reds * * * and, above all, let us quit sabotaging the effort, if we are to make it at all, to resist effectively until the Reds decide to live and let live.

Meanwhile, loyalty isn't a one-way street. The fighting men are doing their fullest part for their commander in chief. He owes them a better deal than they got in this last "truce."

The Late Honorable Herbert Bonner

SPEECH

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished predecessor in the House, the Honorable Carl T. Durham, has sent me a statement to place in the RECORD in the memory of his lifetime colleague and close personal friend, the late Honorable HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to comply with Mr. Durham's request, particu-

larly in view of his intimate association with Mr. BONNER in the House and his personal affection and regard for him. Mr. Durham's statement follows:

I wish to extend to Mrs. Bonner and the people of the First Congressional District of North Carolina my deep and sincere sympathy in the loss they have sustained in HERBERT'S passing. For more than 40 years HERBERT and I were close friends, and I served with him in the Congress for more than 20 years. His personal popularity and the high esteem in which he was held extended throughout the House of Representatives and the Senate as well. During the many years in which he served the first district he gave to his constituents a dedicated service. He will now take his place in the history of our State of North Carolina as one of the great and effective men to serve in the U.S. Congress.

But the canvas of his achievements was not restricted to his district and State, for, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he made significant and enduring contributions to our national maritime policy which will long be remembered.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Eva and the family in their great bereavement, which is shared by all who knew HERBERT and his sterling worth to his district, State, and Nation.

Rabbits From the L.B.J. Hat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the Elkhart Truth, Elkhart, Ind., recently had excellent editorial comment on the President's state of the Union message. I am pleased to include it herewith:

[From the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth,
Jan. 14, 1966]

RABBITS FROM THE L.B.J. HAT?

In his state of the Union message Wednesday evening, President Johnson concocted a formula to finance the expanded Vietnam war, carry on an extensive Great Society program, and still avoid inflation.

And if the President had pulled 27 rabbits from a hat in full view of his prime-time TV audience, the feat hardly could be considered more amazing.

The question is whether he really can pull all those political rabbits out of his big Texas hat.

Not without reason, skeptics are questioning that the budget deficit can be held anywhere near as small as L.B.J. envisions from his program.

If it can't a likely result is more inflation and higher prices.

And his idea of temporarily restoring auto and telephone excise tax cuts, which took effect January 1, is justly criticized, too.

The President wants to help people with small and moderate means, but such people also use phones and cars.

Besides, a main idea of the cuts was to stimulate sales, production, and jobs which in turn would mean more income and corporate taxes also needed to finance the Federal Government; to large extent raising the excise taxes again would be taking money from one pocket to put it in another.

As for inflation, the White House exerted quiet but heavy pressure against steel price hikes; but where was the White House pres-

sure (even vocal) before the city of New York had to give in to the transit workers' court-defying strike, and allow a massive new benefit package? What will that do to the cost of living?

(Even if the White House couldn't do anything officially about the transit impasse, it might have expressed its moral judgment against defiance of the court).

L.B.J.'s idea of extending terms of House Members from 2 to 4 years has much to recommend it. True, a new House Member hardly learns the ropes before he has to go out and campaign again; and, for all House Members, campaign time comes around too often and this intrudes on regular business. It is also true that, coming at a time of a big Democratic majority, such a measure will tend to freeze Democrats into office longer.

We applaud the President for seeking legislation which will let the Government "effectively deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest"; for a cooperative effort to make rivers clean; and for the creation of a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation to pull together 35 present agencies thus involved.

As for the President's suggestion of stimulating trade with Communist Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R., we certainly wouldn't favor such policy in case of those countries now aiding the Vietcong, as Senator DIRKSEN says some are doing.

We approve of Mr. Johnson's determination that U.S. fighting men will stay in Vietnam as long as Red aggression continues; like him, we don't want the war to continue a moment longer than needed to halt such aggression.

But we're plainly skeptical of his everything-but-the-kitchen-sink fiscal policy.

Survey Says Negroes Lift White Area Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SURVEY SAYS NEGROES LIFT WHITE AREA VALUE

A nationwide survey shows that prices of owner-occupied housing rise when Negroes move into white, inner-city neighborhoods.

"This should finally destroy—once and for all—the myth" that Negroes cause private housing prices to fall, Sherwood Ross, information and research director of the Washington Urban League, said yesterday in issuing the results of his survey. Ross made the study on his own initiative and not for the Urban League.

The survey was based on comparative market value and population statistics for 1950 and 1960 in U.S. Census tracts in 47 large cities.

Ross said that it is the first nationwide survey of privately owned and occupied houses in center cities. He added that his results were confirmed by three prior studies of individual cities and by a spot check system employed by the U.S. Census Bureau to verify its own census studies.

The survey was based on every measurable census tract, a total of 1,810, in 47 cities with populations of 100,000 or more.

It counted 1.3 million private inner-city homes of which 100,000 were nonwhite, most-

ly Negro. Ross excluded from his survey about 1,200 tracts which were mainly commercial, industrial, or had their boundaries so changed in 10 years that they could not be compared accurately.

The survey showed that while housing prices for predominantly white neighborhoods (85 percent white or more) increased about 35 percent in the 10 years, prices in predominantly Negro neighborhoods increased 61 percent.

But Ross pointed out that the average Negro inner-city home still remains much lower priced than the white inner-city home.

Changing neighborhoods—areas which lost about 10 percent of their white populations and gained Negro residents—showed a market-value increase of 42 percent.

Integrated neighborhoods—areas which remained racially stable over the 10-year census period—showed an increase of 45 percent in market value.

Ross pointed out that prices are skyrocketing in predominantly Negro neighborhoods because there is not enough good housing available and because the increasingly affluent Negro middle class is spending much of its income to improve existing housing.

Alabama Industry Leaders Warn of Danger in Proposal To Legalize Situs Picketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Congress will again be called upon to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, to permit secondary boycotts. Under pressure from labor lobbyists we are constantly deluged with propaganda designed to force favorable action on this amendment.

This week, members of the Alabama delegation in Congress heard another side of the story, presented at the annual Washington meeting of Associated Industries of Alabama. Mr. Luther W. Hallmon, personnel manager of O'Neal Steel, Inc., of Birmingham, made the report, and I include it here for the enlightenment of all the Members of Congress.

STATEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS FIELD, BEFORE THE ALABAMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, BY LUTHER W. HALLMON, PERSONNEL MANAGER, O'NEAL STEEL, INC., BIRMINGHAM, ALA., JANUARY 24, 1966.

Subject: Common situs and reserved gate picketing.

In discussing what effect an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, such as that proposed by the Industrial Union Department and the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, would have on labor-management relations, it might be well to take a look at what we are really talking about. Let us take, for example, common situs or reserved gate picketing concerning a manufacturing plant which is being built at a cost of \$60 million. As the plans to build the plant mature, a prime contractor is hired to build the plant. When the prime contractor receives the go-ahead to begin construction, there immediately becomes a need for subcontractors since very

Mr. Melnychenko has done an excellent job of indicating why this is the case, and I take the liberty of quoting him:

Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation under Soviet domination behind the Iron Curtain. Its population of over 40 million ranks with that of England, France, or Italy. The territory exceeds in square miles that of France.

Economically, this rich territory has placed Ukraine second in the world in the mining of iron ore, third in pig iron smelting, fourth in coal mining and steel production, and at or near the top in agriculture, being particularly outstanding in livestock, sugarbeet, and grain production.

Historically, the centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. One of the first victims of Russian Communist aggression, Ukraine has proved to be the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible manmade famine of 1932-33, the mass murder at Vinnitsa in 1937-39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine.

The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

Why I Oppose Vietnam Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to include in the RECORD the following article by Dr. John P. Roche:

A DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR EXPLAINS: WHY
I OPPOSE VIETNAM CRITICS

(By Dr. John P. Roche)

(NOTE.—Dr. John P. Roche is Morris Hillquit, professor of labor and social thought at Brandeis University in Waltham, Mass. He was national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action from 1962 to 1965, and is the author of numerous works on American politics, the most recent being "Shadow and Substance, Essays on the Theory and Structure of Politics.")

(The article expressing his views on the anti-Vietnam movement was written specially for the Detroit News.)

I have been actively involved in arguments over American foreign policy since the eve of World War II, but I confess that never in my memory has there been such an intense outpouring of irrational bitterness as we are seeing today.

Only the high point of "McCarthyism" could possibly match the tirades that are appearing on the subject of Vietnam, and not since I denounced the John Birch Society in print some 5 or 6 years ago have I received the kind of hate mail that has been coming in lately: "Drop dead you — baby-burner."

What is peculiar about the anti-Vietnam movement (or movements—there is no monolithic organization) is that its headquarters are found in what is often called the "intellectual" sector of American society, but that the atmosphere in which it operates is reminiscent

not of intellectual argument and discourse but of the primitive religious camp meeting complete with hymns, chants, and apocalyptic visions.

And what passes for argument is, at least to one who has made a life's commitment to rational discourse, appalling beyond belief. Recently, for example, after I had presented my views in support of the administration's policy a young man leaped to his feet and impaled me with "Would Christ have carried a draft card?" The best I could do was say that one intelligent question deserved another and asked him, "Would Christ have carried a social security card?"

ANTIWAR ARGUMENTS EXAMINED

Since the opponents of our intervention in Vietnam have refused to carry the logical burden of setting out their premises in coherent fashion, let me try to examine what I take to be the different grounds on which an American can rationally come out against the Vietnam war.

Starting at the simplest level, an individual may oppose the war because he does not want to take any time out from his career for military service, because it would make his mother nervous if he were in the Army, or even because the pay is insufficient.

These are quite rational stands, though hardly adequate as a foundation for national policymaking. Nor—it must be emphasized—do they supply much of a base for a radical critique of the "warfare state"—whatever the content of "radicalism" may be, it is certainly not built around the proposition "I want to survive."

Everyone has a constitutional right not to be a hero (I have exercised my privileges under this heading on occasion), but he has no right to dress up his human failings in a halo of higher morality.

By definition then, the "radical intellectual" must base his opposition to our involvement in Vietnam on principled rather than expedient grounds. And anyone claiming the status of an intellectual—radical or otherwise—is under the compelling obligation to formulate his views with logical consistency: he cannot leapfrog his premises anytime one of them begins to seem inadequate.

If he rejects violence, he must do so on the basis of generic commitments. If he says "I reject war because innocent people are killed," he is forbidden any favorite wars.

Now on what principled grounds can an intellectual denounce the war in Vietnam? It seems to me there are two principled bases of opposition.

The first is an absolute rejection of war as an instrument of international policy which should be accompanied by an equivalent rejection of violence in personal relations.

This is, of course, the classical pacifist position nobly exemplified in our time by A. J. Muste and the American Friends Service Committee. The pacifist, whether religious or humanist, has made a total dedication to a world without violence, has adopted what Max Weber called an ethic of ultimate ends, and is quite prepared to "speak truth to power" whatever may be the personal consequences.

I am unable to accept the final demands of pacifism. Yet I am quite prepared to recognize and honor those who take this position. They are spokesmen for what is probably an impossible ideal, but I hope, in the interests of my descendants, that their ideal will triumph.

However, I must live with my limitations, and I am simply not capable of arguing that the Indians should passively submit to the Chinese, the Israelis to the Arabs, or the black Rhodesians to the whites (or for that matter the Negroes of Mississippi to the Ku Klux Klan) in the name of this ultimate vision of nonviolence.

Thus, while I cannot accept his premise, I have no quarrel with the pacifist who objects to our intervention in Vietnam: He is,

in Thoreau's phrase, marching to a different drum and his dedication to his objective transcends the mundane criteria of international relations as we know them. In the Augustinian sense, he is in this work but not of it—his allegiance is to a city of God which the rest of us can only imagine as a misty, remote aspiration. His witness demands our respect.

If one is not a pacifist, he may still find a moral basis for condemning American policy in Vietnam by arguing that—while violence per se is not necessarily evil—the goals of public policy are immoral and corrupt all the instruments. It is not that innocent women and children are dying, but that they are dying unnecessarily as a consequence of an evil policy.

An individual with this approach could logically support war in defense of India or Israel while opposing our activities in Vietnam. But this line of argument requires considerable support. One cannot simply say that he is prepared to use violence in situation X but in situation Y on grounds of personal taste, because he likes Indians or Israelis. Any charge of immorality, in sum, has to be formulated on some consistent theoretical infrastructure.

THERE CAN BE ONLY ONE ANSWER

What basis is there for charging that we are engaged in an immoral war in Vietnam?

Pacifists excepted, there can only be one answer: that the Communists are right and we are wrong, that we are engaged in an "unjust war." The techniques of war-making are irrelevant—if we are wrong, it would be as immoral to fight with crossbows as with jets and napalm.

Similarly, the fact that innocent women and children are dying is in itself irrelevant—if we were right, as we presumably were in fighting Nazi Germany, the death of the innocent would be written off as an unfortunate byproduct of necessary and just acts.

We must then turn to the question of the justice of the Communist cause in Vietnam since this and this alone can provide principled grounds to the nonpacifist opponent of U.S. policy. (There are a number of expedient grounds for opposing the war and taking an isolationist posture in Asia, but we are here concerned with the moral bases of opposition.)

Prof. Eugene Genovese, of Rutgers University, stated very frankly: "I do not fear or reject the impending Vietcong victory in Vietnam. I welcome it." From his vantage point as the prophet of the Marxist weltgeist, Genovese sees the confrontation in Vietnam as one between an historically progressive north and a reactionary neocolonialist south.

If one shares Professor Genovese's Marxist religious convictions, it is patent that the United States is the "buttress of reaction," that we are trying to derail the locomotive of history, and that we are fighting a rear-guard action against the forces of "historical progress."

By definition a war against socialism must be immoral—Professor Genovese and those who agree with him have thus set forth a consistent case for opposing the war. Those of his persuasion and the integral pacifists are, I submit, the only individuals who have established their standing as moral critics of American intervention.

PRACTICALITY RATHER THAN MORALITY

Let us now turn to the other types of anti-war argument which can be broadly designated as expedient or pragmatic.

Here we have a broad spectrum ranging from new-fashioned isolationists on one extreme to the "American protection is more hazardous than Communist tyranny" position at the other. These objections to our actions run against their practicality or productivity rather than their morality.

An interesting development has been the conversion of a number of liberals, and even

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A395

It is my firm belief that this is an unwise, and an unfair tax. It is largely a levy on capital and not on income. It penalizes elderly owners of homes and farms who wish to sell and retire into smaller and less expensive quarters. It penalizes owners of investments who wish gradually to shift their holdings into more conservative securities as they gradually attain their less productive years. It prevents many constructive business transactions that would be in the public interest, especially the ability of small and weaker enterprises to merge with stronger organizations rather than be forced to discontinue operations which provide our citizens with jobs. And last, but not least, it has sterilized vast pools of risk capital, substantial portions of which otherwise would find their way into risk investment in new and small business ventures and thereby afford vast new employment opportunities, new productive capacity, and new sources of tax revenues to the Treasury.

It is for these reasons that I am introducing a resolution which provides that the alternate rate of tax on long-term capital gains be reduced from 25 percent to 12½ percent.

It is my firm conviction that this bill is a revenue-producing measure.

If this tax rate were so changed, investment in our economic system would receive substantial encouragement, new jobs would be created and the Treasury would actually gain revenues as a result thereof. After all, no one has to sell his capital assets, but a great many would willingly do so if the tax rate were made more realistic.

I welcome the bipartisan support of my colleagues in bringing this bill to early committee consideration, separate and apart from other revenue measures. I am sure the evidence produced before them at the attendant hearings will convince them of the wisdom of enacting this legislation.

We Do What We Must**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the prevailing topic among most editorial writers and other commentators has been "Can this Nation afford both guns and butter?"

Last week Mr. Norman Brewer, news director of television station WMCT in Memphis, gave an incisive commentary on the President's state of the Union message, pointing out that we must give first priority to the conflict in south-east Asia.

I certainly agree with that.

If it can be done, I think it is most important that we continue with our programs to provide everyone in the country with adequate medical protection and to give all of our children a

good opportunity to acquire a first-class education.

Keeping in mind that the gross national product of this Nation is now three times what it was in the Korean conflict, it seems to me quite possible that this high goal can be achieved.

At this point in the RECORD, I include a transcript of Mr. Brewer's remarks:

WE DO WHAT WE MUST

(The Norman Brewer report, WMCT, Jan. 13, 1966)

President Johnson said last night the state of the Union is that it has "children to teach, sick to be cured, men to be freed, poor to be lifted up, cities to be built, and a world to be helped." The President said "we do what we must" and he urged that we do it all. Mr. Johnson spoke with eloquence, clarity, and determination on the war in Vietnam. He began by saying that conflict must occupy the "center of our attention." He said we will stay in Vietnam "as long as aggression commands us to battle." To yield, the President said, would "undermine the independence of many lands and whet the appetite of the aggressor and abandon Asia to the domination of the Communists." But with our guns and steel, Mr. Johnson made it clear that we seek only a just peace. In the meantime, our fighting men must have "every gun, every dollar, and every decision."

The great burden of an Asian war should be enough for this Congress. But Mr. Johnson put the crusher on. He asked the people's representatives to pursue with equal attention and vigor, the domestic programs with which he hopes to build the Great Society. He asked not for a mere continuation of all the myriad welfare programs begun last year. But an expansion of them and the opening of new Government responsibilities: From the rebuilding of "whole city slums" to highway safety.

The President spoke glowingly of a deficit this year of "only \$1.8 billion." To hold it to that figure, he called for an increase in the automobile and telephone taxes reduced only 12 days ago and by some as yet vague method of "improving" the system by which Government withholds taxes from our paychecks. The possibility of further tax increases was not ruled out. This is, as Mr. Johnson said, the wealthiest Nation on earth. How long it can stay that way, Americans must wonder tonight.

Americans, already feeling the new pinch of the new social security-medicare tax, must wonder about the wisdom of accelerating domestic programs that traveled too fast for efficiency last year. They may not question that this Nation will "do what it must"—but they must question how much it can do.

The goals set by President Johnson last night—peace, health, and prosperity for all—are the goals of any humane, civilized society. The methods proposed by the President—the building of Rome in 1 day—is something for this Congress to pass on. And let the Congress remember that soon the people will have a chance to pass on this Congress.

**James Dooley: Past President of the
Central Labor Council of Hawaii****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Central Labor Council of Hawaii during

the immediate past 5 years was guided by a dedicated and talented president in the person of James M. Dooley. Under his able leadership, the council proceeded with extreme effectiveness through the achievement of solidarity among the ranks of the AFL-CIO, never before known.

Mr. Dooley has now left the 50th State to accept the responsibility of the position of port agent for the Sailors Union of the Pacific in Portland, Oreg. His leadership and demonstrated concern for the public weal will be sorely missed in Hawaii. He takes with him Hawaii's heartfelt gratitude and best wishes for his future success and happiness in his new endeavor, as expressed in the resolution adopted by the Central Labor Council. I insert this resolution in the RECORD:

**RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL OF
HAWAII, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Whereas James M. Dooley has been president of the central labor council for the past 5 years; and

Whereas James M. Dooley has served with distinction and very often performed services above and beyond the normal call of duty; and

Whereas the central labor council has flourished and grown with Brother Dooley at the helm; and

Whereas James M. Dooley's talents as a political statesman, diplomat, and prime mover have helped to achieved solidarity among the ranks of the AFL-CIO in Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates assembled at this central labor council meeting do on behalf of themselves and the local unions, which they represent, commend James M. Dooley for his contribution to Hawaiian labor and offer him our sincerest appreciation and heartiest best wishes for success and happiness in his new assignment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President George Meany and Brothers Paul Hall and Morris Weisberger and to the Oregon State Federal of Labor and the Portland Central Labor Council.

Unanimously adopted this 19th day of October 1965.

A Day To Celebrate**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. ANCHER NELSEN**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alexander Melnychenko, Jr., of Minneapolis, has written to call my attention to Ukrainian Independence Day which we celebrated January 22, and which the House has officially noted.

I want to join the courageous Ukrainian people and their relatives in this country in noting this historic Independence Day, proclaimed so proudly in 1918. Even though Ukrainians found their newfound freedom and independence cut short by brutal aggression, those in this country are well aware that these human aspirations continue to be the goals of the united Ukrainian people.

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A397

some alleged radicals, to the dogmas of geopolitics, traditionally a reactionary entertainment.

The great expectation among these neo-Machiavellians is that, with the proper bribe, Ho Chi Minh will become a "Tito" and presumably rush to contain Red China. The problem with this is that the Red Chinese have not been leaning on Ho: Tito, after all, did not become a "Tito" for the sheer novelty of it. But our geopolitical finaglers may devise some way of getting the Chinese Communists to put the arm on Ho (perhaps with a research grant from the CIA).

A variation on the geopolitical theme suggests that we should turn the South Vietnamese over to Ho, make the Russians happy, the Red Chinese mad, and thus stimulate the Sino-Soviet schism. Somebody has, I think, suggested that we could improve this scenario by giving the South Vietnamese to the Russians to give to Ho.

I think this bush league Machiavellianism is childish nonsense: for one thing, it is unwise to dabble in the heresies of other men's churches. Moreover, E. H. Carr's observation on a similar effort in geopolitical horse trading sticks in my mind as a warning to our self-styled "realists."

"The negotiations," Carr remarked in 1939, "which led up to the Munich Agreement of September 29, 1938, were the nearest approach in recent years to the settlement of a major international issue by a procedure of peaceful change." Unfortunately, the Nazis refused to stay bought and Carr had to do some rewriting for the next edition of this work.

The most persuasive argument for getting out of Vietnam rests on what might be called updated isolationism. Ironically, isolationism is in the 1960's a functional position; i.e., it is feasible for the United States to devote itself wholeheartedly to affluence in one country and let the rest of the world slide off into chaos.

Weapons technology has ended our need for foreign bases: with ICBM's and naval power we no longer have any military rationale for involvement outside of the Western Hemisphere. (The Soviet Union is in roughly the same position and obviously there are strong drives toward isolationism within the Soviet leadership.)

The Tory shadow Minister of Defense, Enoch Powell, recently suggested to the Conservative Party Conference that the British should liquidate their commitments east of Suez and watch development from the sidelines; a leftwing Laborite intellectual (with the casual racism which is so pervasive in British conversation) put it to me more bluntly: "Let the woggles fight it out."

SELFISHNESS IN FOREIGN POLICY

In this spirit—which is profoundly conservative in the psychological sense—an American can argue that the game in Asia is not worth the candle.

What difference does it make in the overall balance of world power whether South Vietnam is inside or outside the Communist sphere? Why lose American lives and waste American resources? Why generate internal tensions, risk a revival of "McCarthyism," chance a general war? Why get involved in a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing? More broadly, what difference does it make to us if the Africans butcher the Bantu, the Arabs overrun the Israelis, or the Chinese crush India?

Now that "Fortress America" is a militarily viable proposition (vulnerable only to a nuclear attack which a policy of disengagement from the world could hardly provoke), why not pull back behind the moat and enjoy ourselves?

After all, who are we to impose our value system on other people; Sukarno may have known his customers better than we do when he observed that democratic government

was not "in harmony with the Indonesian soul."

It is not my intention to caricature this position—although I obviously have no use for it, it has to be understood as the most effective rationale for disengaging, not merely from Asia but from Africa and even Europe, as well.

There is a liberal version which emphasizes cultural relativism ("What right do we have to tell Asians how to run their affairs?") and a reactionary version which pushes racism ("Asians—or Africans—are incapable of building free societies"), but the net result is a united front of utilitarians in full agreement that national selfishness should be the foundation of American foreign policy.

And what strikes me about the current debate on Vietnam is that most of the opponents of our intervention spout moral axioms like a geyser but in fact rest their position on precisely this new isolationism, this modern international application of what Karl Marx called the "pig philosophy." I have no objection to Sermons on the Mount, but I have no interest in hearing one from Machiavelli.

As I am out of sympathy with the anti-Vietnam movement and only the pacifist critique has any attraction for me, I should briefly explicate the basis of my support for the defense of South Vietnam.

I dislike war intensely; 3 years of my life were excised as neatly as an appendix by World War II, and the last thing I would wish for anyone is a similar journey into limbo, if not Hell. But I am not prepared to turn 15 million South Vietnamese over to the Communist terror regime in Hanoi.

EFFECTIVE MILITARY CONTROL

Yet this is what unilateral disengagement—no matter how much it is prettied up—amounts to. One demographic point should be made perfectly clear: 95 percent of the population of South Vietnam lives on roughly 20 percent of the land area. Thus the allegation that the Vietcong "controls" 80 percent of the countryside has no representational significance. About 80 percent of Vietnam has no significant population (less than 20 per square kilometer) and it is these jungle plateaus which the Vietcong "control."

In other words, in effective military terms the United States and South Vietnamese forces "control" those sections of South Vietnam—the cities, the coastal plains—where the population concentration rivals that in Belgium.

I emphasize this because the casual newspaper reader might have the impression that most of the population of South Vietnam is already under Vietcong control so that our departure would have only a marginal impact.

This demographic situation is also important in two other contexts: first, it makes the "enclave theory"—which I was one of the first to propose—quite feasible. We can hold the population centers indefinitely, establish ground security (particularly in the delta), and let the Vietcong and the NLF exercise unlimited sovereignty over the bush. The enclave theory provides a sound basis for fighting a limited war.

Second, if one examines carefully where in the South there has been intense bombing, he discovers that the overwhelming percentage of strikes have been in areas of low population intensity. In Pleiku Province, for example, where the heavy bombers have been extremely active, the normal civilian population is about 5 per square kilometer; in Binh Duong, another prime target, the population is less than 100 per square kilometer and this population is concentrated in five towns which the bombers have avoided.

MINIMAL IMPACT ON THE PEOPLE

In short, the common notion that American aircraft are bombing and strafing the

Vietnamese equivalent of Dearborn, Mich., is completely inaccurate. Indeed, there has not been a single bomber strike, or strategic air-to-ground strike by fighter aircraft (i.e., a strike which is not part of a ranging battle) in any administrative subdivision of South Vietnam with a population concentration of more than 100 per square kilometer.

The United States has made every effort to operate with minimal impact on the Vietnamese people—and the 700,000 to 800,000 refugees from the Vietcong who are thronging camps in the South obviously voted with their feet for the Saigon Government.

The nub of the matter is that the Hanoi regime is a brutal, ruthless dictatorship. (Ho and Giap disposed of their version of Students for a Democratic Society in 1946–47—"unreliable elements," "Trotskyites," and hemi-demi-semi-Marxists, who had fought for independence against the French were summarily executed.)

I recently met a Vietnamese doctor who was, in 1945–46, a leader of the Viet Minh in the South, was deemed a "Trotskyite" by Giap, invited to an underground meeting in Hanoi, and betrayed to the French. Fortunately, the French officer assigned to execute him turned out to be a former classmate at the Ecole Polytechnique who permitted him to escape.

The Hanoi regime has operated a massive terror in the North—murdering perhaps 200,000 alleged "kulaks" in the course of collectivizing agriculture—and has sought to extend its terrorist hegemony to the South, where about 30,000 South Vietnamese officials have been murdered since 1960. Hanoi's aim, clearly expressed, is the "liberation" and "unification" of the South and only American power has stood in the way.

I am glad that we have rejected the selfish counsels of isolationism and intervened to defend the South. Rightly or wrongly, I believe that the American people have an obligation to other human beings, that our power in the world should be used within the limits of prudence to forward the ideals that we cherish.

This does not mean that we impose democratic institutions on the South Vietnamese, but it does involve our making it possible for the South Vietnamese to continue the search for alternatives rather than being assimilated into a frozen dictatorship.

Unfortunately, we rarely have a nice clean choice in this world between good and evil and the South Vietnamese Government hardly inspires the enthusiasm generated by the late Spanish Republic. Yet differences of degree are crucial, nobody can argue that South Vietnam is a dictatorship (its key problem is weakness) and the possibilities of future growth in freedom do exist.

It is perhaps unreasonable to ask Americans to fight and possibly die for such a tenuous objective. As Norman Thomas pointed out in 1940, it was absurd to ask Americans to die for a crew of Polish fascists (he has updated the same speech for current use). But in 1940 (as in 1966) the real issue was not the relative immorality of the Poles (or the Saigon regime) but the character of the aggressor.

After agreeing with Norman Thomas—and marching around in antiwar demonstrations in 1940–41—I came later to realize that in opposing American intervention against Hitler, I had unknowingly countersigned the death warrants of perhaps 30 million people.

I resolved that never again would I support—to recall E. H. Carr's phrase—a "settlement of a major international issue by a procedure of peaceful change" which involved turning human beings over to a dictatorship.

This is perhaps a hopelessly naive position for a professor of politics to endorse, but it has the virtue of simplicity in a world where complex explanations are generally an excuse for inaction or for escaping from the starkness of reality.

A398

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 27, 1966

When all is said and done, the fact is that Ho Chi Minh would put me against a wall and shoot me—a sound action from his ideological viewpoint. He would also shoot most of the intellectual leaders of the anti-war movement—indeed he already has shot any North Vietnamese intellectual who showed signs of independent thought.

At the risk of seeming anti-intellectual, I long ago decided never to give an inch to anyone who would shoot me or those who share my ideals. Those intellectuals who enjoy the luxury of living in a society where dissent is a magazine and not a capital offense, seem to me to have lost sight of this vital human imperative.

The Menace of Drunken Drivers on Our Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last December there was a tragic accident caused by a drunken driver on an interstate highway which resulted in the death of the wife and youngest daughter of the Stark County superintendent of schools. Stan Perrin has been a long-time personal friend of mine, a very fine Christian gentleman, an outstanding citizen and pillar of his community. He raises the question as to whether Federal legislation is in order.

The matter of drunken drivers on our streets and highways is certainly a matter of concern in the area of highway safety, which the President in his state of the Union message says should be dealt with in this session of the Congress. I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the full text of Mr. Perrin's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD and commend its reading to my colleagues, with the hope that it might put some wheels in motion to remedy this unconscionable carnage on our highways:

OFFICE OF COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT
OF SCHOOLS, STARK COUNTY, ILL.,
Toulon, Ill., January 17, 1966.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: As you no doubt know by now that a drunken driver killed two of my loved ones, my wife, Gertrude and my youngest daughter, Judy, on December 18, 1963, in Missouri. We were driving to California to spend Christmas with our folks out there. We were traveling on Interstate 44 between Springfield and Mount Vernon, Mo. The driver, who was drunk, was driving down the wrong direction on a four-lane highway.

My daughter cried out, "Dad, here comes a car." For a moment I was so startled when I heard this as I was in the passing lane and was watching the traffic on my right and naturally was not expecting any traffic coming toward us. By instinct I pulled the car to the left to try to avoid him, as I could not turn to the right because we were passing cars which were in the right lane. If I had had a little more time I could have missed him, but as it happened he hit my right fender in front and tore through the entire right side of the car killing my loved ones instantly. They never had a chance.

When I finally stopped we were down in the median and by some chance the car did not upset. I was dazed for a couple of minutes and finally got out of the car to assess the damage. I went around on the other side and there I found my wife and daughter laid out. It was a horrible picture that will remain in my mind forever. I hope you never have to experience such a thing.

Here is a case of two fine talented, Christian people killed by an irresponsible known alcoholic who had had several other wrecks previously. This is no different than letting a criminal run at large with a gun shooting at people. Judy was to graduate from Bradley University on January 30, 1966, and had a position waiting for her in the Oak Park, Ill., schools beginning February 1.

Many people in this area and elsewhere, who know us, are certainly up in arms over this and have asked me to write to you seeking your help in getting some Federal legislation to protect others from drunken drivers. The U.S. Constitution guarantees each individual the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Gertrude and Judy were deprived of this by a drunk. It seems that the President, Congress, and the Supreme Court are so obsessed with sponsoring civil rights. They should be equally obsessed in trying to put a stop to drinking and driving, which is just as much a part of civil rights as the Negro situation. There is a Federal law against kidnaping punishable by death. It is much more serious for a drunken driver to kill innocent persons as it is to kidnap someone.

Therefore, I strongly urge you to do everything in your power to enact a Federal law that will be tough that it will deter this carnage on our highways. More than one-half of the highway fatalities are due to drunken drivers.

I would like to see a law that automatically carried a penalty of life imprisonment of a drunken driver who killed a person on the highway and 10 years imprisonment of an individual who is caught drinking and driving. Also included in such legislation should be provision for requiring a test of an individual who is suspected of drinking and a further provision similar to the Dram Act in Illinois that will hold tavern operators responsible for selling liquor to individuals after they have had too much and then go out to drive on the highway.

Probably the liquor interests will fight this kind of legislation, but something drastic must be done.

It is ironic that all of my life I have been against drinking and then have two of my family killed by a drunk.

If you would sponsor such legislation and could get it enacted into law you would gain the esteem and admiration of many people in this area as well as in other parts of the country. My relatives and their friends in California are writing to officials out there to back some legislation relative to implied consent for testing drivers suspected of drinking. I understand Gov. Pat Brown is against this. That figures.

I plan to do everything in my power to get protection for others against drunken drivers, so they will not cause others to suffer the heartaches I am experiencing due to such individuals. I plan to write some open letters to various newspapers using some of the ideas expressed to you.

Please do everything you can to help me and others, Bob. Your efforts will be gratefully appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

STAN PERRIN.

P.S.: If you have the opportunity, please show this letter to Senators DIRKSEN and DOUGLAS, as well as others in the House. Thanks.

STAN.

Scrimping at Veterans' Hospitals Strains Ties With Medical Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, on October 19, 1965, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11668, which would provide for closer cooperation between the medical training schools of this country and the Veterans' Administration.

Earlier this month, the National Observer, one of the Nation's foremost newspapers published an article which points up the problem which H.R. 11668 intends to correct. The author, Walter A. Damtoft, who, I might parenthetically point out, is another North Carolinian who is distinguishing himself in the field of journalism, has very cogently described the "fraying partnership" between the Veterans' Administration and our Nation's teaching hospitals.

This news article eloquently supports the argument for immediate attention to a very serious problem, the deterioration of relationships between the VA and the medical schools which are affiliated with the veterans hospital program.

I would like to have Mr. Damtoft's story printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that other Members of the House may have the opportunity to become more familiar with the problem. The article follows:

A PRAYING PARTNERSHIP: SCRIMPING AT VETERANS' HOSPITALS STRAINS TIES WITH MEDICAL SCHOOLS

(By Walter A. Damtoft)

For several years physicians attributed the severe chest pains suffered by a middle-aged World War II veteran to psychosomatic reaction to an earlier heart attack. Whether the pain was real or imagined, the veteran was unable to work. Finally he was examined at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Durham, N.C., a stark, red-brick structure a long block from the Gothic buildings of the Duke University Medical Center.

VA and Duke Hospital physicians made intensive tests and examinations, including cineangiographs, or movie X-rays, of coronary blood vessels. The patient was found to have real cause for pain: A heart muscle wasn't getting adequate blood. The veteran now awaits an operation to sew blood vessels from his chest wall to the heart muscle to supplement its blood supply.

The diagnosis and the heart operation that likely will enable this veteran to return to work are among the medical advantages of a strikingly successful affiliation of many medical schools with VA hospitals. But these partnerships, fashioned in desperation at the end of World War II, are beginning to fray. As is the case in so many marriages, the basic problem is money.

EQUIPMENT GROWS OBSOLETE

In surveys conducted by both the VA and the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), many medical-school deans have complained that VA hospitals are becoming understaffed and that much of their equipment, particularly X-ray devices, is becoming obsolete. Some deans even speak reluctantly of terminating their affiliations unless the Government sees to it that VA hospitals are

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A403

amples of Michigan's use of specially designed classrooms. The law school has an authentic courtroom presided over by experienced judges. The music building boasts two organ rooms and a rehearsal hall large enough to hold the university's symphony orchestra or the 206-piece marching band.

Standing on the campus today, one would not guess that Michigan, which opened its doors in 1841, is among the oldest U.S. universities. New buildings and residences are constantly being built to accommodate the freshmen who storm the gates each fall. (Total enrollment this year is more than 30,000.) But physical expansion, continuing by leaps and bounds, hasn't diluted the school's quality. The University of Michigan continues to be an outstanding example of vastness-cum-excellence.

FIRST-RATE FACILITIES EASE THE TEACHING TASK

Michigan may be one of the oldest schools in America, but it's far from being old fashioned. In order to handle the tidal wave of students and yet maintain standards of excellence, the university has embraced electronic teaching aids on a wide scale. The medical school, with 4 color and 11 black-and-white cameras, is noted for having the largest television installation of any U.S. medical school. In the department of education, student teachers can observe on TV the methods of instructors conducting classes nearby. Similarly, law school students have the proceedings in a local court piped into their classroom via closed-circuit TV.

In the language labs, one can dial directly for any of 432 taped lessons in 22 languages. Not only in electronics, but in many fields of science and technology, Michigan stays in the forefront. With its laboratories, hospital, aquarium, and other facilities, the university is a valuable center of research.

LOOKING ON THE LIGHTER SIDE

"Enjoy yourself, it's later than you think," says the song, and students at Michigan take this advice. Concerts, plays, sports, and songfests fill their leisure hours. The giant campus bursts with so much culture that one student from New York marveled, "Where else, unless I just stay home in Manhattan, can I hear as many different kinds of music, see as many plays, look at so much painting?" There's plenty to cheer about on the athletic fields, too, for year after year Michigan's teams rank with the Nation's leaders. And for those not content to be spectators, there is a wide variety of sports such as tennis, archery and hockey. But the most common form of relaxation can also be the most enjoyable—those satisfying gabfests shared with friends.

Congratulations to Paul A. Miltich**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, Paul A. Miltich, a correspondent for the Booth newspapers of Michigan, has been elected to membership on the standing committee of correspondents.

Paul's election victory—he received the highest number of votes cast—indicates he is held in high esteem by his colleagues.

We join other members of the Michigan delegation in congratulating Paul Miltich in his victory and he has our best wishes for a successful term of office.

Quiet Solution to Vietnam**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a number of letters asking, "When are we going to win the war in Vietnam, and why not?" Some of them say no more than this. I have replied to these letters with the request that they advise me where they are obtaining their "canned" question, but to date have not had a response.

I have advised these people that their question was hostile and by implication misreads the intentions of the United States as enunciated by our President and by Secretary of State Rusk. Furthermore, I have pointed out to them that exceptionally skilled and capable students of foreign affairs have indicated the complexities of the problem with which we are faced. I feel that these questioners should know of the relationship of our difficulties in Vietnam with the problems elsewhere in the world.

An article by George Kennan, widely respected for his astuteness in foreign affairs, clearly points out this interrelationship. I commend it to my colleagues, and ask permission that it be inserted following my remarks.

QUIET SOLUTION TO VIETNAM: U.S. EXPERT ON COMMUNISM CITES FUTILITY OF FURTHER ESCALATION

(By George F. Kennan)

(NOTE.—Former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, Kennan is an authority on world communism.)

There are, I am sure, many besides myself who would have preferred to remain silent in the face of a discussion so shrill and confused as that which has revolved around the Vietnam problem in recent months.

But the challenge advanced a few days ago by the Freedom House statement, "Placing the onus on those who remain silent and fail to make clear the American consensus," is a fair one and its authors can have no complaint if it is responded to, in this instance, by one whose voice not all of them always hear with sympathy.

Our adversaries in Vietnam are people for whose predilections and purposes no one in this country need have the faintest sympathy. Allowed to have their way, they would impose a ruthless dictatorship in any area under their control; and the experience of other Communist countries (leaving aside, for the moment, Yugoslavia) does not suggest that this would be followed by economic or social benefits remotely commensurate with the loss of liberty and the isolation from the world community this tyranny would involve.

DEMONSTRATORS' INTENT

The young Americans who march around with Vietcong flags or profess to favor a Vietcong victory are choosing a very strange way to demonstrate an attachment to the cause of either independence or freedom, if this is indeed what they are interested in.

On the other hand, to recognize that this is so does not mean that is necessarily the duty of the United States of America to set all this to rights. Understanding of democratic ideals is not widely spread among the human race. There are more instances of oppression and of the abuse of power in this world than the United States alone can ever

hope to remedy, and some of them are closer to home than Vietnam.

Nor is it clear that such Vietnamese as we might find to install in power in the unlikely event of a sweeping military success (for surely who would not wish to hold the country indefinitely under direct colonial administration) would be inclined, or even able, to rule with any markedly greater liberality.

TWO QUESTIONS

The questions we have really to ask ourselves when we think of the future of Vietnam are primarily two: first, to what extent a future Vietnamese regime would be likely to accept a status of subordination to one of the two great Communist states and to represent an extension of its political and strategic power; and secondly, what would be the effect of the settlement on the neighboring areas.

As to the first of these questions: It is unlikely, in the face of the Chinese-Soviet conflict, that even a Communist regime in any part of Vietnam would find it necessary or desirable, in normal circumstances, to subordinate itself entirely to either of the two great Communist powers. If Hanoi has today come into a one-sided and unhealthy relationship of dependence on Peiping, this is surely primarily the effect of the discipline exerted by the war itself. In the event of a termination of hostilities, there would be neither necessity nor advantage from the North Vietnamese standpoint in retaining a wholly one-sided alignment. But for a smaller Communist country to attempt to preserve a balance in the relationship to the two great ones means, as we see from other examples, to exercise a high degree of independence in external relations generally.

Thus even in the event of a complete Vietcong victory (and I am not suggesting we settle for anything of this sort), the result would probably be something less than the automatic extension of Chinese power that many of us fear.

As to the second question, that of the reaction of other countries: This is of course a very serious consideration. Our Government is justified in citing it as a main reason why we could not contemplate any precipitate and disorderly withdrawal. But the elements of this "third country" problem have undergone important alteration as a result of recent events in Indonesia and probably in India and Pakistan as well. One wonders whether these changes have been fully taken into account. Our latitude of action would seem to be greater than it was when we first committed our forces to action in Vietnam on a serious scale.

DISBALANCED POLICIES

The most disturbing aspect of our involvement in Vietnam is its relationship to our interests and responsibilities in other areas of world affairs. Whatever justification this involvement might have had if Vietnam had been the only important problem, or even the outstanding problem, we faced in this world today, this not being the case, its present dimensions can only be said to represent a grievous disbalance of American policy.

For nearly a year now we have sacrificed to this effort all serious possibility for improvement of our relations with the Soviet Union, with all this implies from the standpoint of the ultimate danger of nuclear war; and this we have done at a time when prospects for such improvement were otherwise not unfavorable. We have placed a great and deeply regrettable strain on the friendship and confidence of the Japanese people. A pall of discouragement has been cast over those responsible for the conduct of the United Nations. Constructive treatment of the great problems of Germany, of nuclear disarmament, of the future of the United Nations, and of China in the wider sense has everywhere been placed largely in abeyance, in deference to this one remote involvement.

All of these problems are more important, for the long term, than what happens in Vietnam; and there is none of them that will be usefully met even by such further military successes as we may have in the Vietnam area—rather the contrary.

UNFORTUNATE CONCENTRATION

The effects of this unbalanced concentration of resources and attention on a single area of world affairs are unfortunate enough even as things stand today. They could be much more unfortunate if we were to be suddenly faced, as we easily could be, with a simultaneous crisis in another area where our interests are importantly engaged.

This being so, if we can now find nothing better to do than to embark upon a further open-ended increase in the level of our commitment, simply because the alternatives seem humiliating and frustrating, one will have to ask whether we have not become enslaved to the dynamics of a single unmanageable situation—to the point where we have lost much of the power of initiative and control over our own policy, not just locally but on a world scale.

None of this should be taken as inferring that our Government has been guilty of obvious stupidities. At no time in the history of this whole unhappy affair have its choices been easy or obvious ones; and the worst feature of the many violent demonstrations of opinion in this country, pro and con, has been that they have so vehemently suggested that they have been. Questions about past decisions, furthermore, are not answers to the problem we face at this particular moment.

On the other hand, it will not do for the administration simply to turn to its critics outside Government and say: "What would you suggest?" No one who is not privy to all the available information and who cannot give a large proportion of his time to the study of public questions could make useful suggestions for specific action in a situation so vastly complicated as this.

The administration could perhaps get more help from public discussion if it could find less exalted and more meaningful terms in which to describe its own predicament. Public understanding is not aided by the demands that the North Vietnamese cease their aggression which fall so regularly from the lips of senior State Department officials. We are not dealing here with established sovereign states. The situation does not lend itself to classification under established concepts of international law.

Nor does it help us much to be told that our Government is determined "to live up to our commitments." Commitments to whom? To some South Vietnamese Government? If so, to which one? When and where did we assume the obligation to sacrifice to its defense the whole balance of our policy and the wider interests of world peace? And is this commitment conceived as something related to its own performance, to its own ability to command the confidence of its people? Or is it the people of Vietnam themselves to whom this commitment is conceived to relate?

NEGOTIATION OUT

Obviously, there feelings cannot today be consulted in any orderly way; but can we be sure, on the basis of what we now know of their reactions, that to have this conflict continue to be fought out on their backs is really preferable in their eyes to the consequences of even the most unfortunate political settlement?

If, in short, what we are actually fighting over is the preservation of some balance of power in that part of the world, which is something about which we have every right to be concerned, let us then discuss the problem in those terms and not try to drape our action in legalisms and moralisms.

No one can question the thesis that a precipitate withdrawal, representing the

total capitulation of our entire position in that region, would be one of the worst of the alternatives before us. No one will deny that the other side is today wholly unresponsive to any and all suggestions for negotiation—particularly negotiation with us. I wonder, however, whether negotiation—particularly early negotiation between Hanoi and ourselves—is the only, or even the most promising, way out of this situation. Prospects were never good, at any time, for agreement between the North Vietnamese and ourselves on any sort of publicly-negotiated, formal contract, defining what political conditions should henceforth prevail in the disputed area. Hanoi cannot join us, the "imperialists," in publicly instructing the Vietcong, partially a South Vietnamese force, to be politically unsuccessful.

ARBITRATOR NEEDED

There would be a better chance of this situation's simmering down, through a series of reciprocal unilateral actions on the part of the main protagonists, to a point where it becomes somehow manageable, as so many other tense situations have done in recent years, than of its being resolved by contractual agreement between ourselves and one portion of the other side. If we wish to develop this possibility of a simmering-down (and it is, unhappily, the most promising of all the possibilities we face) then we must be prepared, it would seem, to let the talking be done for us, quite privately and without elbow-jogging on our part, by our friends and others who have an interest in the termination of the conflict; and then we must be prepared, depending on such advice as we receive from them, to place limited restraints at some point on our military efforts, and to do so quietly, without published time limits or ultimata, where we have reason to hope such restraints will meet with adequate reciprocation from the other side.

NO GUARANTEE

No one can guarantee the success of this approach; and there are many who, in the light of the pretentious terms in which our objectives have often been cast, would consider it inadequate even if successful. But is it hard to imagine anything better. I would not know what "victory" means in these conditions. In this sort of a war, one controls what one can take and hold and police with ground force; one does not control what one bombs.

And it seems to me the most unlikely of all contingencies that anyone should come to us on his knees and inquire our terms whatever the escalation of our effort. If it be once accepted that in the present difficult situation the security of our own forces is the cardinal consideration, that it is better to hold smaller areas securely than to hold larger ones insecurely and that immediate objective is not to bring the adversary to the negotiating table but to bring about a mutual lowering of the intensity of hostilities, then perhaps the advantages and disadvantages of such an approach will appear in a different light.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, the Ukrainian Americans in my State celebrated the 48th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. On

that day, in 1918, the Ukrainian Rada, or Parliament, proclaimed Ukraine's independence. The Ukrainian declaration of independence was called the Fourth Universal. Although the Ukrainians had taken advantage of the Russian revolution to proclaim their independence, they soon found that the new masters of the Kremlin were no more willing than the czars to allow them their right of self-determination. For 2 gallant years the Ukrainian patriots held out against the superior numerical strength of the Bolsheviks. But although the Soviets finally conquered the Ukrainian land they could not win the allegiance of the freedom-loving Ukrainians.

Peasant uprisings continued long after the Red army had occupied the Ukraine. During the Second World War Ukrainian patriots organized against both the Nazis and the Soviets. Even today stories of opposition to Soviet rule reach Ukrainian Americans.

I am sure I speak for the Congress and the American people when I reaffirm my dedication to the cause of independence for the Ukraine. For the American people, Mr. Speaker, have always believed deeply in the self-determination of all nations. As the Ukrainian experience clearly demonstrates, the fires of freedom are not only unquenchable, in our shrinking world they are also indivisible.

Address by Harold L. Tweedy Favoring Federal Charters for Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I learned today that President Johnson in his Economic Report has urged the enactment of legislation to provide Federal charters for mutual savings banks.

I have introduced legislation to accomplish this for many years and I hope that during the current session we will see this proposal enacted into law.

An increasing number of savings and loan associations favor Federal charters for mutual savings banks, and in an address to the 19th midyear meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks on December 14, 1965, Harold L. Tweedy, president of the First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Pittsburgh spoke of the reasons for this favorable attitude.

I commend Mr. Tweedy's address to the attention of our colleagues:

WHY AN INCREASING NUMBER OF SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS FAVOR FEDERAL CHARTERS FOR MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

(Address by Harold L. Tweedy, president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Pittsburgh, presented at the 19th midyear meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, December 14, 1965, New York City)

In the last year or two I have had the privilege of exchanging ideas on the subject

A412

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 27, 1966

Franklins, and Marshalls foresaw when they wrote and interpreted the early Constitution. Not the least of the reasons behind their logic in a 2-year House term based on population and a 6-year Senate term giving equality to every State was this very check-and-balance philosophy, for which no better substitute has ever been devised. Adding to the formula, the executive branch, replaced each 4 years, and a judiciary more or less permanent and traditional, we seldom face the embarrassment of harsh and hasty legislation or, on the other hand, of a Congress totally incapable of action at a time when action is vital. With a 4-year House term this balance might be upset.

In any case, we ought to talk out thoroughly and logically any drastic change in the highly workable government equation we have built by now—R.L.T.

A Dirty War**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, each time human beings take up arms against each other then God must repent just a little that He created a species which has such difficulty getting along with its own kind.

Any war is terrible; but the war in Vietnam is particularly terrible.

Self-righteous, self-proclaimed, liberators of that stricken land, the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese allies, think nothing of murdering civilian populations which defy them. This includes—almost as a matter of course—women and children.

I think we will all agree with the sentiments expressed about the latest incident of this type in the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 26, 1966:

DIRTY WAR

The cruelties inflicted on the Vietnamese people by the Vietcong are so commonplace that it takes a savage incident to get the world's attention. Such an incident occurred on the eve of the recent Tet truce, in the refugee camp of Tu Hiep. Communist guerrillas stormed the unarmed camp, burned it to the ground and murdered 33 civilians.

Children were cut down with submachine-guns. A school built for the refugees was destroyed.

The motive for the massacre seemed to be revenge. Several of the Tu Hiep refugees had fled from a nearby village shortly after the Vietcong overran it. This apparently was insulting to the guerrillas, who constantly proclaim that they symbolize the true aspirations of the Vietnamese people. So they punished the villagers by slaughtering them. And to make sure that the world didn't misunderstand the butchery, the guerrillas scattered several leaflets among the bodies, denouncing America for its "dirty war of aggression against the people of Vietnam."

The Tu Hiep massacre rebuts the argu-

ment, popular among Vietcong apologists in this country, that the guerrillas enjoy the affection of the Vietnamese villagers. Guerrilla influence seems to extend no farther than the snout of a submachinegun. When the guns recede, the villagers flee—and the standard Vietcong reaction is more bloodshed among the innocents they claim to represent.

Letter to President Johnson**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week 72 of our colleagues signed an excellent letter to the President urging him to continue efforts toward a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Vietnam. I was out of town at the time this letter was circulated or I would have been one of the original signators.

I associate myself with the views contained in that letter and so informed the President yesterday. I submit herewith the text of my letter to President Johnson.

JANUARY 26, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. PRESIDENT: I would like to associate myself with the view expressed in the letter to you of January 21, 1966, signed by some 72 of my House colleagues. Unfortunately, I was out of town when it was sent or I, too, would have been an original signer.

I heartily endorse their support for your peace initiatives combined with your determination to show Peking and Hanoi that their policy of aggression and subversion cannot succeed.

I join in their hope that you will continue unceasingly our efforts to bring the Vietnamese conflict to the conference table. We must always keep the burden of continuation of these hostilities on the Communists. I hope you will reconsider U Thant's proposal to acknowledge a Vietcong role in negotiations and in an interim government. This seems so eminently inevitable, sensible, and important to demonstrate the sincerity of our resolve to achieve peaceful settlement. I hope you will also reconsider bringing the conflict before the United Nations.

I feel you have the confidence of the vast majority of the people of this country in your thoughtful and restrained handling of this difficult and frustrating situation.

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Member of Congress.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

January 27, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A411

"The Communists tried to gain followers by pretending to help solve our problems," Horvat explained.

He helped to organize the peasants and formed a peasant export and import association, then a farmers' savings and loan association, and later a newspaper, which he edited. He also helped to form agrarian reform, education, and youth groups as the peasants became a strong enough voting bloc to elect some of their members to the Yugoslavian legislature.

Then Nazi invaders struck.

Horvat and his wife, Mary, fled with their four children to nearby Croatia, where he began to organize persons to help refugees, political prisoners and other victims of the war. Arrested by the Gestapo, he once again was sentenced to die. He was herded with other political prisoners onto a train for Slovenia.

He found himself with 80 others in a small, dirty, unheated room. Prisoners took turns sleeping on the floor—because it was too small for all to lie down at once. Food was scarce, but interrogations long.

"Executions were held every Tuesday," Horvat recalled matter-of-factly. "I was to be shot with 150 other men and women on October 2, 1942. I hoped I would be among the first killed, so I wouldn't see the others being shot."

But only minutes before the time set for the execution, Horvat was ordered once again onto a train, headed for a prison in Croatia. As the train rolled through the town where his family had settled, it stopped. Paul Horvat jumped off and fled into the forest.

He learned later that his wife and friends had arranged his transfer, and a sympathetic railroad worker had stopped the train near the forest.

The Horvats' return to their home in Slovenia was not happy. In a few days Horvat was arrested by the Communists, who feared his popularity as a peasant leader.

He was released, but he fled when his rearrest was ordered and his land confiscated.

Police imprisoned his wife and their children to force his return, and kept Mrs. Horvat in an unheated basement without warm clothing. When she became severely ill, the family finally was released. They also fled Yugoslavia and joined Horvat in applying to enter the United States as displaced persons.

More delays again split the family as the three oldest children went to England under a work program. Mr. and Mrs. Horvat and their youngest son, Paul, waited 6 years in Austrian refugee camps.

It was during those years that Horvat organized the Congress of International Peasants Movement. In 1948, 3,500 delegates met in Austria and elected him president.

After more delays and hardships, the Horvats and their youngest son finally arrived in New York in 1952—with only \$10 with which to begin a new life. A strike ended Horvat's first job, in a Gary, Ind., steel mill.

But a newspaper ad for household and garden help in Illinois opened the door to opportunity. The Horvats were hired, and within a year had saved enough money to begin their own landscaping business. And in the next few years, they saved enough money to bring their three oldest children to the United States—and to aid many other refugee families.

Horvat now operates his nursery business in Illinois with his son Branislav. The Horvats' other children also live on Chicago's North Shore.

But Horvat feels there still is much work to be done for freedom. He says, "The farmer is the key to liberating the world from communism." "The peasant is a very strong individual who, by his nature and tradition, is tied to the land. The peasant has the

most vital interest in defending his land or fighting to regain it.

"Farmers also tend to be nationalistic and religious, forces which counteract communism.

"In addition, communism thrives on misery. To fight communism, we must fight misery, not wars—which kill people rather than ideas.

"People in the free world often minimize the importance of freedom," the freedom fighter reflected, "but like sand in our hands, if we do not hold it firmly, it will slip away between our fingers."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The material in the foregoing article was taken from the Wilmette, Ill., Life.)

No Time for Haste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Review this week contains an interesting editorial which evaluates the proposal to extend the term of a Member of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years. The purpose of the editorial is to urge caution and most careful debate over this proposition and I believe that the reasoning which the editorial sets forth deserves review by all the Members of the House.

My own thinking has been drawn to the historical and constitutional reasoning behind the original establishment of a 2-year term. The system has worked well through most of the years of our history. At times it has resulted in some balkiness during periods when smoother transition might have been expected. On the whole, however, it has provided flexibility and established certain safeguards in maintaining a balance of Government which have worked well.

Consequently, the hesitation which I have felt about possible change without appreciable major gain has been strong. I believe that the responsible committee should look closely at all arguments relating to this constitutional change and that we in the House should debate it thoroughly in seeking the proper action. For that reason I hope that these arguments may be part of the measures we apply to the amendment when it comes before the House.

I recommend that this editorial be published in the RECORD.

NO TIME FOR HASTE

President Johnson's proposal to extend terms of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 years to 4 is understandably popular with the Congressmen themselves and, if the Gallup poll is substantially correct, with two-thirds of the electorate as well. The President, urging swift action, told Congress the other night that the present 2-year term "requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving this Nation of the fullest measure of their skill and their wisdom." A longer term the President argues, would attract more men of the highest quality to political life since they would have greater security and would not be forced constantly to go

home and mend fences, but could concentrate their reelection activities in those years divisible by four.

But flexibility and fluidity must ever be the watchwords of government in an atomic age. Before Congress too hastily alters the intricate system of checks and balances that have worked reasonably well in the American government system, we strongly urge caution and the most careful debate rather than the "swift action" the President requests. The 2-year House term was not a quixotic, offhand notion, and to fix our legislative processes into a less subtle and more rigid form might be a disastrous mistake in the atomic age.

The Founding Fathers had sound reasons indeed for placing the House of Representatives on a biennial basis, reasons as true today as they were in 1787.

A lower House elected every 2 years more perfectly reflects the changing moods of the common people than one that stays in office for the same 4 years as the President. One does not have to go back further than 1928 to realize the sensitivity of the electorate to rapidly changing political and economic conditions, for had Herbert Hoover's majority remained intact in the House until the eve of the inauguration of Franklin Roosevelt, no one knows how near open revolution the country might have come. Similarly, the biennial election reflects much more swiftly and accurately changing population patterns. Faced with a 4-year wait until redress, many exploding urban areas might gradually be disfranchised at times when such highly metropolitan issues as civil rights, public housing, air pollution, and integrated transportation were being debated and voted on in an unrepresentative House.

Flexibility was the keynote and cornerstone of the Federal Constitution. Those wise souls who produced the incredible document sought checks and balances wherever they could find them so that no one man or branch of Government could force a foolishness permanently on the common people. Members of the House have always been elected every 2 years by popular vote, but Senators were elected by the State legislatures as recently as 1913. And the continuous overlap of the 6-year Senate term with three separate and much more sensitive Houses did not result from chance or whim but came about after great deliberation and as a careful compromise between the big States and the small.

Under the British political system, a majority in Commons can come tumbling down at any time under the stress of public dissatisfaction with an issue or trend. Popular as he was, Churchill suddenly was no longer His Majesty's First Minister when, as World War II drew to a close, the British people felt that the time was ripe for domestic reform and that Labor could accomplish it faster than Tory Churchill. This sensitivity to issues is vital to the democratic system, though it can induce bad overtones sometimes through the constant bickering of the opposition. But since the U.S. legislative system does not even have this much sensitivity to the pressures of new issues and new equations in an atomic world, any measure designed to reduce representative sensitivity by a longer House term should be debated carefully and thoughtfully and not be rammed through by voice vote without thought for the consequences to the checks and balances originally intended in the bicameral philosophy.

Bicameral legislation historically recognized the distinction between the nobility and clergy—the lords and ladies of inherited wealth and position—and the common people. The dualism now prevalent throughout the democratic world is, fundamentally, an application of the principle of checks and balances that the Jeffersons, Madisons,